

ing class and not the middle class, and when I raise my voice in its defense, of immediate demands. I want it clearly understood that it is the immediate demands which will be put into operation if the Socialists get control of Congress in the United States, that it is an injunction to our representatives in any legislative body that we want immediate government ownership of railroads, of telegraphs, of telephones, and other public affairs of that kind by the various governmental bodies, or administrative bodies, for the purpose of improving the condition of the wage-earners engaged in those industries.

There is a little step to be taken before we realize our ultimate aim. There will be several years required for the transition period, and during that period there are different conflicting interests between the small capitalist element and the large capitalist element, between the higher power and the lower power in the capitalist class, and during the time when the small capitalists are trying to get relief from the burden of taxation and other things they will advocate the government ownership of railroads and other things in order to release them from those burdens. The Socialist party will aid them in getting the government ownership, but always with this purpose in view of shortening the hours and taking advantage of that assistance which in some cases we may get from the smaller capitalist to bring about the final extinction of all capitalism.

**A DELEGATE:** I never saw a Socialist convention in such a muddle. I want to be protected from an opportunist's platform on one side and an impossibilist's platform on the other. What is the situation here? The platform says we only want the land that is used for exploitation. Leaving out of consideration the millions of acres of land that are held out of cultivation, or out of use for many purposes—

**DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.):** That is exploitation.

**THE DELEGATE:** The impossibilists want ownership of all the means of production and distribution, which would mean the whole of my yard, if I raised some potatoes. They are both confused, and it is due, in my opinion, to the manner in which our platform is drawn. I stand for immediate demands,

but I don't stand for immediate demands unless the platform first tells us that what we want is a government by the working class, and it does not do that. When I see a plank in the platform that tells the American working people that the Socialists stand for government by the working people, the working class, a working class dictator, then I am in favor of immediate demands, but not before. One of the speakers, Comrade Simons, talked about Utopianism. Is it Utopianism to talk about an industrial state? Does the Platform Committee stand for a political state? Under Socialism what will be the state, a political representative state, or an industrial state? You have the political state, the present police state, of shipping and of all that goes with it. If Comrade Simons understands Socialism, and I believe he does, then he knows that the Socialist movement has for its aim to do away with the political state and substitute the industrial state. I maintain that the platform does not point that out. The platform is Utopian in its preamble. I maintain the purpose of the Socialist movement is to get control of the Government and establish a dictatorship over the working class, under which ownership of the means of production and distribution may be brought about.

**DEL. WANHOPE (N. Y.):** I wish to take a few moments of your time regarding this question of the nationalization of railroads, telephones and telegraphs, contained in the first clause of the discussion. The delegate from Illinois tells us that where there is national ownership of public utilities it has benefited the working class. I am not going to deny that. From my reading, I am inclined to believe that there is a great measure of truth in it, but I want to say right here that there is nothing absolutely necessary in the fact that national ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, or telegraphs, benefits the working class. It generally does, however, but the reason I stand for it, is this, and this is a point that I think has been forgotten by all the speakers here. Today, we are seeing encroachments after encroachments on the regime of private property in the means of life, and every time a utility is taken over and made public by nationalization, even with a capitalist gov-

ernment in control, so much does it limit the area of private ownership in the means of production and distribution.

President Roosevelt is a good deal wiser than some of the delegates here, because when he sees these encroachments upon private ownership and calls them the greatest national disaster that can take place, he does that because he knows that when one encroachment is made upon the arena of private property, it means opening the door to all others, and so far as this is advocated by the middle class, it is merely part and parcel of the same process of preparing society for collective ownership, which the great trusts and the big capitalists are doing in preparing society for this coming change. Let me say that if you understand the Socialist philosophy thoroughly, you are not confused in argument by the fact that certain classes in society are trying to save themselves by simulating something that you want to do. Every one of you knows that the middle class is dying. Your philosophy shows you that it is doomed. It is between the upper and the nether millstone, and must disappear. But you are afraid that this petty bourgeois element in its desperate effort to save itself by nationalizing utilities is thereby going to save itself. They cannot do that. They are playing into your hands, because you understand the philosophy of the situation, and they do not. It took me a long time to see some of these things. If you understood that no matter what they do, or what they don't do, they cannot stop this irresistible drift toward Socialism, it will greatly simplify this whole matter. I care little for government ownership in itself.

You can't go to Russia and tell me the people are better off there, but I see this movement as part of this irresistible process, and the capitalists themselves are digging their own graves, and when you see a little bourgeois shouting for government ownership of gas, or telephones, or telegraph, you simply see him digging shovelfull after shovelfull out of the hole in which we will later bury the whole capitalist system. His efforts are exactly the same as the efforts of the trade unions trying to reach the question of the monopoly of labor by increasing his wages. He cannot do it. If a little business man does get his margin over taxes increased, it means

simply that the great trust is going to take that margin from him a little later on and his last state will be worse than his first. I ask you to consider today that every factor working in society is not working against you. Some of them are working in your direction, and it is your duty as a Socialist to co-operate with them. We are not going to get Socialism at once. There are a great many things that we are going to stand for that are of no immediate benefit to the working class. They are part of the road that we have to travel. You may say that we see the cooperative commonwealth in the future, but it lies away ahead. We are not to reach it in one bound. We do not know all the roads, the mountains, the valleys, the swamps and the pitfalls that lie between us and that co-operative commonwealth, but we do know that every force and tendency in society is working in the direction of that co-operative commonwealth.

**DEL. HAZLETT (Mont.):** I would like to add the voice of Montana for a constructive theory of Socialism. As was said by one of the grandest woman workers for International Socialism—she said that those who defended the ideas such as we have heard here in the name of revolutionary, scientific Socialism, that the persons who advocated them were either very young or very ignorant. So it is, my friends, when we talk of the new order of society into which we hope to come, we talk about revolution without ever attempting to do anything to revolutionize the present system. How in the name of common sense can we change our condition without working upon some plan by which we can formulate that change? I remember one time hearing the president of my university, David Starr Jordan, say that we had reached the time when mankind consciously affects the evolutionary process. Whatever that change may be, the fact is, we go, we ourselves have got to chisel out with the power of the human intellect which we have developed. We have got to formulate the change that is to come. I would not undertake to say whether we could all at once take over all the land or whether the little farmer should have his very farm, but I want to say that in Montana where the state already owns large areas of coal fields, that there is

an immediate proposition that the Socialists of Montana have got to work upon. So wherever we reach points upon which we, as representatives of the working class, can work, that is the thing that we should work upon, the thing next to us in the interest of the working class, anything that will strengthen the hands of the working class, anything that will help them to move forward and make progress against capitalism, and it is in our own doorway where we must fight him today. I question very much if upon a large comprehensive basis it is not going to be easier for us to expropriate the bondholders than it is the private capitalists. The private capitalists can give some sort of reason for their existence upon the ground of being a promoter, or of superintendency or something of that sort, but the bond holder can give no reason, no real reason, to society why he should draw his income from them; and so it is, my friends, speaking for Montana and for what we have in a very small way entered upon—we have been striving for a constructive plan of work, something that everyone can see is a benefit to the working class, and that is one reason why I think that this party should formulate demands in the interest of organized labor, as they go into the campaign confronting and fighting the capitalist government with its courts, that we should make this a battle cry, a battle program around which we could rally. I also thank Comrade Fieldman of New York, who spoke here with reference to the unemployed, for the two points which he brought forward where the Socialist party has shown its intelligence, the matter of unemployed and the rent strikes in New York City. We stand for a constructive platform, at least the Montana delegation does, and I hope this convention of American Socialists will take their stand with the International Socialists of the world for common sense and reason against hot air and ignorance.

A DELEGATE: I move the previous question.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been called for. Those in favor of that motion will say aye. Those opposed, no. The ayes have it.

DEL. FURMAN: My motion was

moved and seconded before any other motion that the words "all the land" be inserted in the first plank of the platform and there has been only one or two of the comrades who have spoken to the point. I take the position with the soapboxers on the corner—perhaps my experience has been about the same as the rest of you—about three times out of four there will be a single taxer come to the meeting and you have got to answer him, and if you don't have an express explicit statement in your platform, you will have to take up a large portion of your time talking in language which the average fellow coming along the street will not understand to make you position plain to that individual, because you have not worded your platform properly, making him understand and all others understand what you are driving at. The plank as it stands with the exception of that one omission is all right. Do you want a platform plank there that you can put intelligently to the ordinary working man who comes to the street corner and make him understand? If you want that, then you must necessarily have the public ownership of land there. That does not say that somebody is going to have the privilege of using my tools, my brush or my trousers. Neither does it say that every individual who occupies land and uses it as he has to do in the house in which he lives cannot occupy that land and that house. But it does put the thing plainly to the people who are not all educated up in terminology which you use and which I use in the Socialist propaganda. I want it so plain that the wayfarer, though a fool, can understand it and read it while he runs. I want that in there and I have been instructed from New York in a general way to have that plank voted for, and I want it at the head of the platform because I consider it the most important plank in the platform, and it should be worded so plainly that the men who go out to explain Socialism can make the wayfarer understand what they are driving at. As land is one of the necessary essentials in the means of production, it should be in the platform. You should have it in such words that no one will have to go around and ask somebody else what it means. It does not mean that we shall take away the farmer's little piece of land which

he is working on; it doesn't mean anything of that kind, but if you don't put that in there it gives every Tom, Dick and Harry who knows anything about the theories of Henry George an opportunity to make trouble for your speakers, to upset everything you say and finally you have got to come down to the proposition that land is just as necessary as tools.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have before you the proposition of the committee, proposed to be amended by inserting the words "all the land" and seconded by the substitution of "collective" in place of "national," where it pertains to the industries, and third you have the main question. Now, they are so bound up together that it is impossible to make a division and get a clear understanding of the whole. I shall rule that on each side shall be two for and two against the proposition and I must hear from the speaker which side he or she speaks for, and whether it is the main question, the first or second amendment.

DEL. CANNON (Ari.): I want to point out to Comrade Clark of Texas, that when I called this matter to the attention of the convention last evening and asked Comrade Simons what was the meaning of the word "exploitation" Comrade Simons did not answer my question. Comrade Work came to his rescue and I was hammered down.

I contend that the public ownership of all machinery and land is one of the things for which the Socialist party is working. If some of the comrades get up and tell us in Germany they are not working for that I move that we inform the German comrades that they are behind the times. The idea of not including the land is nothing more nor less than political expediency. I am going to refer to a farmer state, and if newspaper reports are true it is the most prosperous farmer state in the union, and that is Oklahoma. Discussing this proposition with the delegates from Oklahoma I learned that eighty-nine per cent of the farms in that state are mortgaged. You come along with revolutionary Socialism. Now are you going to keep those farmers under that mortgage? Hearst or Billy Bryan would be ashamed to go out and offer those farmers such a proposition as that. They tell us that we are ruining the laboring class of private ownership, but for political expediency we must not relieve

the farmer of private ownership. I want to relieve the farmer. In Arizona we have more locals among the farmers than we have in the industrial centers, and we don't preach graduated income tax or government ownership of railroads. We teach straight Socialism and the farmers are just anxious to get rid of their farms. The same condition exists in New Mexico and I am informed that in Texas the farmers are intensely anxious to get rid of the farms.

It was decided to have only four speeches after the ordering of the previous question, instead of four speeches on each question and a closing speech by the chairman of the committee.

DEL. COLE (Cal.): I speak against this first clause in the report of the committee, and I urge all constructive brainy and thoughtful people to listen to this argument.

Comrades, there is nothing I desire more than a constructive platform, and the basis of that constructive platform must be greater power in the hands of the people. This clause is for national ownership of railroads, etc., etc., and the further you take it the worse you make it, and for this reason. You and I all know that our authorities today represent only the capitalist class, and every atom of public property you put into their hands to handle the worse you make it for the people. The first thing you want is greater democracy, the initiative and referendum, the imperative mandate, and in a practical form, and those should come first before we have any public ownership more than we have now.

Seven men control all the railroads west of the Mississippi from Canada to Mexico. Now then, you want public ownership of those railroads. Why? Because one set of capitalists want to do down another set of capitalists. That is why you want national ownership of railroads. Suppose you get it. You will have them and these people will put the capital released from the railroads into other industries. We Socialists don't mean it that way. Don't you know—you do know—you do know that the Democratic party and that the Hearst party will make the same pledge in their platforms. Don't you know—you do know that we won't get any votes for our ticket by that sort of thing. The people who want that sort of thing will say there will be more votes for the Democratic party and so we will vote

for them. But it is not a question of what we want to get. I want to say that there is a very serious danger before the American people, more so than ever before. We have organized our industries to a greater extent, we have larger capitalist and trust control than any other people on the face of the earth and the greatest danger we have to face is the further organization of capital, the further organization of capital, before we have the power in our hands to control it. Comrades, you have read that work by Jack London which paints the centralized organization of capital, the growth of this enormous power in their hands. When we have the initiative, the referendum and the imperative mandate, then we can control the situation. We should make that our immediate demand. That should come first and then the Socialists and the working classes will be in such a shape that we can control legislation and safely take hold of these great energies and run them ourselves.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I speak in favor of the committee's report and against the amendment inserting the word "land." I am in favor of the amendment substituting the word "collective" for "national." There is one point that I want to make and that is that the committee to which the platform is to be referred as to style and so forth should put in the word "socialist" after the word "other" and make it read "every other social means of transportation and communication," because I think we are all agreed that we don't want the public or collective ownership of buggies, bicycles, and so forth, with which people transport themselves.

Like Comrade Furman, I have had a little experience in speaking on the subject of Socialism, not only on the streets of Chicago, New York City, and on Boston Common, but also in the villages and hamlets in the East and in the Middle West and in some portions of the far West, and I know the greatest objection which the Socialist agitator has to go up against in those places and which the local comrades of the Socialist party have to go up against in those places is the fact that the farmers think that we want to deprive them of their

little farms, which they are using on their own account. I don't want a paragraph, or a word, inserted in this platform which will uphold the idea that we are going to expropriate the little farmer, because the little farmer is not an exploiter. We have stated in the body of this platform which we adopted yesterday that the small farmer is exploited, not in the same manner, but none the less effectively, as the wage worker. We have already adopted that proposition, and therefore we have taken the stand that the small farmer is not an exploiter. If he is not an exploiter and exploiter, is not using the land for exploitation, why should that land be publicly owned? We do not need to make it publicly owned for the purpose of carrying out our object. If we declare for the collective ownership of that land, then we lar all of that great section of the working class out of the Socialist movement, because they will not stand for it. The farming industry has taken an altogether different course of development from the other industries. It has been demonstrated by actual experience that the great farm cannot compete with the small farm, and therefore the collective farm is not scientific or economic. Cries of "no, no," and "I don't believe it."

DEL. WORK: Furthermore, the fact that the farmers do operate their farms privately, that material fact, the material surroundings of the farmers have their necessary psychological effect upon them and cause them to be opposed to the collective ownership of farm land, even if it were economic. The farmers are a portion of the working class, and we want the whole working class in the Socialist movement. We should not make a declaration of our platform which will bar out any section of the working class, but should try to attract the whole working class to our movement. The farmers of the United States can be attracted to the Socialist movement if we will simply use a little common sense in order to state our position clearly so that they will not misunderstand it and will not think that we intend to take away their little farms.

Adjourned until 2 P. M.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The convention was called to order at 2 P. M.

### COMMUNICATIONS.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: We have lots of greetings. We have only telegrams before us now; and comrades, some of these telegrams are very important.

Here is one from the Young People's Socialist League, Chicago:

"Grand success to the Socialist convention. Three cheers for International Socialism."

One from Urbana, Ohio:

"Be courageous. The eyes of the world are upon you, Socialists. Fraternally,

"F. Brown, Presr."

"The Scandinavian Socialists send through their weekly newspaper greetings, hale and hearty. Your achievement will be our inspiration."

"G.A.A. P.A.A."

"Girard, Kansas, May 15, 1908.

"Ben Hanford, Care Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago.

"Hearty congratulations and hand-clasp across the spaces. The posts of honor assigned us are posts of honor only because they are posts of duty and responsibility. You will vindicate brilliantly the wisdom of the convention and I hope at least to keep it from reproach. Greetings to the greatest convention ever assembled in the United States. Cheers for the revolution."

"Eugene V. Debs."

"Girard, Kansas, May 15, 1908.

"Frederic Heath, Secretary Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago.

"Nothing would give me greater joy than to appear before the convention and make in person my acknowledgement to the delegates, but an extraordinary situation makes it next to impossible for me to leave here at this moment, and I am reluctantly compelled to beg for the first and only time the convention's indulgence until I can report for duty, which I shall do without a moment of unnecessary delay. We have all caught

the inspiration of the unexampled work you have done this week. It will make a shining place in American history."

"Eugene V. Debs."

"Girard, Kansas, May 15, 1908.

"Frederic Heath, Secretary Socialist Party Convention:

"My dear comrades:—Deeply touched by the incomparable honor you have for the third time conferred upon me, I accept the nomination for the presidency, returning to each of you, to the convention as a whole, and to the party at large, my sincere thanks. The hearty unanimity with which the nomination is made and the magnificent spirit in which it is tendered fill me and thrill me with inexpressible emotion and arouse within me all the latent energy and enthusiasm to serve the Socialist party and the great cause it represents, with all the mental, moral and physical strength of my being."

"Personally, I had earnestly hoped the convention would choose otherwise, but as individual desire is subordinate to the party will, I can only wish myself greater strength and fitness to bear the revolutionary banner of the working class you have placed in my hands."

"Permit me to congratulate you upon the nomination of Comrade Hanford, and to express my personal gratification in having a comrade so loyal to share in upholding the proletarian standard. At a later day I shall make formal answer to your nomination."

"This year the command to advance must be issued to all the hosts of socialist emancipation. The working class of the United States must be aroused this year and made to feel the quickening pulse, the throbbing hope, and the stern resolve of the social revolution. The greatest opportunity in the history of the socialist movement spreads out before us like a field of glory."

"The principles of the Socialist party are resplendent with the truths which crown them. Its very name is prophetic and its spirit is literal fulfillment in this auspicious hour supreme with opportunity. Duty to the cause transcends all else, and touching elbows, and hearts keeping time to the quickest steps of the

revolution, we march beneath the banner (no compromise) to certain victory. "My soul love and greeting to you all my comrades. My heart is full and overflowing. With every drop of my blood and every fibre of my being I render obedience to your command, and offer myself, body and soul, to the Socialist party, the working class and the revolution. Eugene V. Debs."

DEL FARRELL (Ohio): I rise to call for three rousing cheers for Comrade Debs. (Cheers.)

#### FINAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Committee on Resolutions I ask the indulgence of the convention that they may present their final report, and if there are no objections we will take this matter up now. There are only one or two resolutions, and then their work will be done.

DEL SPARGO: The Resolutions Committee desires naturally to be relieved of its responsibilities. We have two matters only, which we believe the convention can act upon in a minute or two, and then we will ask for our discharge, and that will prevent the possibility of a waste of time occurring through our having to report from time to time. I will read the resolutions:

#### PROPAGANDA AMONG SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

First: Those of you who have the report of the last national convention before you will find on page 277 a resolution relating to the advisability of conducting Socialist propaganda among the privates in the army and navy and state militia. The Resolutions Committee at the convention four years ago reported adversely and was sustained by the convention by an overwhelming vote. The matter has been raised again, and your Resolutions Committee, realizing that it is impossible for us to do anything in the matter here, desires to offer this resolution:

"The convention recommends that the National Executive Committee consider the question of instituting a special propaganda among the privates of the army and navy and the state militia."

Comrade Chairman, I move the adoption of this resolution, referring the

matter to the National Executive Committee. (Seconded.) Carried.

#### APPRECIATION OF ARRANGEMENTS AND SERVICES.

DEL SPARGO: Second. This is a resolution which surely we can be unanimous upon, as it is nothing more than the ordinary courtesies of a body of this character:

"The convention hereby desires to place upon the record its appreciation of the arrangements for the convention made by the local comrades. To their efforts much of the success of the convention is due."

"Thanks are also tendered to the secretaries of the convention for their arduous and valuable services."

Comrade Chairman, I move the adoption of this resolution.

Seconded and carried. Committee discharged.

#### FINAL REPORT OF FARMERS' COMMITTEE.

DEL THOMPSON (Wis.), chairman of the Farmers' Committee, presented the following report:

I would like to say, first, that we have here a majority report, and that one member of the committee will present a minority report, so that you will have both aspects of this subject before you. This is the resolution which we recommend:

"Resolved, by the Socialist Party that the general program of Socialism will in itself, aside from any specific reference to agriculture, bring a very great measure of relief to the agricultural working classes."

"The socialization of industry, carrying with it as it will a vast improvement in the condition of the wage working class, raising their standard of living and thereby increasing their power, will render more stable the market for farm products."

"The collective ownership of the railroads and the great industrial monopolies, by destroying their power of oppressing the wage earning class, will at the same time destroy the power of the capitalist to exploit the farming class, thus securing to them immediate relief and advantage."

"With reference to the specific application of Socialism to agriculture, the first steps in the program of Socialism

should be taken against the great industries which are ripe for collectivization and already form a virtual monopoly. The farm-machinery trust, the beet sugar trust, the oil trust, the land monopoly, and any other private monopolies that may arise within the agricultural sphere will be socialized among the first."

"And as for the ownership of the land by the small farmers, it is not essential to the Socialist program that any farmer shall be dispossessed of the land which he himself occupies and tills."

DEL THOMPSON: On behalf of the committee I move the adoption of this resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The minority will please present its report.

DEL BARZEE (Ore.): Comrades, you have got me in a very precarious position. I am more used to running around with the cows and the horses than to facing such a sea of faces as I see before me.

I was appointed upon this committee and I took my place with them, and when I present my report you will not find it so very different from the one they have. I want to tell you my reasons for bringing in a minority report.

We were called to convene immediately, which we did, in a back room here, or behind the curtain, and some instructions came to us very forcibly what we should do. We appointed a meeting and we convened at the next point for further consideration of the question. We agreed then, during that meeting, that it was not probable that we could agree, and that we would disagree upon a certain particular point which I will mention later. There was an incident meeting called peremptory, I believe, behind the curtain again, which I attended. We were very near an agreement on this proposition, when we were again informed by one of the members of the committee that it was preposterous for us to try to agree, and I was started off down the road. I was told that there was no compromise on that point, and I left the committee to draft my report. After that meeting I was notified to participate in another one. Expecting the same thing, and not being able to compete with Chicago—I have always heard it was the windy city—I did not go. That committee could outwound me all right.

So if my report differs but little from

theirs, you will understand why I bring in a minority report.

I hereby submit the following minority report and beg your consideration of the same.

"We recognize the class struggle and the necessity for united action among the world's workers of every vocation as against the capitalists class exploitation."

"The Socialist party stands for construction and not destruction, for ad-struction and not destruction, for ad-therby pledges to the small farmer protection through the socialization of the national industry, in the production for use and not for profit."

"We therefore recommend that the farmer study the economics of the co-operative social system as against the individual competitive system, and ally his political power in the struggle for existence with the party in power. But, we insist that any attempt to pledge to the farmer anything but a complete socialization of the industries of the nation to be unsocialist."

DEL CLARK (Texas): I move the adoption of the minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have before you, comrades, the reports of the majority and the minority. The action occurs upon the acceptance of the minority report. Are you ready for the question?

DEL SLAYTON (Pa.): Mr. Chairman and comrades: There is a great deal of room for discussion. I realize, between those who believe that nothing should be done to prevent an individual following the line that his own mind would indicate, that nothing should be done by the collectivity to prevent an individual using certain forms of production, if he can do it himself. Under the machine philosophy, if it may be so dignified, I might use an acre or ten acres or twenty acres of land, or run a little mill or shop or mine myself, if I don't exploit somebody else. There seems to be a great deal of room for argument between those who adopt that line of argument and those who say that even if it is shown that I am occupying a piece of land or a mill or a little shop, like the old shoemaker's shop, if you please, and not exploiting anybody else, it should not be done, because it would not be working for the good of the whole. Some say that that would be a destruction of individuality. If

that be true, then the capitalists are right when they speak of individual initiative and the right of the individual to do what he pleases.

Let us grant for the sake of argument that if I own five, ten or twenty acres of land, and make up my mind that I can stand to work twenty-four hours a day and raise a certain amount of a crop and do it, I ought to be allowed to do it, because I was exploiting nobody else. Let us agree, for the sake of argument that I should have the right to do this; but would it not be more wise to do these things in general society? You would discourage me from even if you didn't want to prevent me in any way. It would be reasonable to use the tools and machinery that have been supplied and by their use save so much human energy. It is not common sense to say nothing of good economy, everything and ought to discourage any individual from wasting his energies.

I am reminded of an answer I made to a man some years ago, on the spur of the moment, to a question that is pertinent right now, and I am going to submit it to you and ask you to consider it. He wanted me to help elect him to congress, and said that he believed in government ownership of railroads, and expected me to fall right in line.

I said, "Why, we have it now," he said, "How do you mean?" I said, "Don't the railroad companies own the government and own the railroads, too? You have got government ownership now."

Then he said he believed in the municipal ownership of waterworks and electric light plants. He happened to be president of an independent oil refining company, and I asked him about oil wells and oil refining machinery, whether he believed in government ownership of those. He immediately went up in the air, and when he came down again I said I was willing to dispossess the railroad companies when he was willing to be dispossessed of his oil wells. Then he said, "Where will you draw the line between social ownership and government ownership—between what the individual might use as his private property and what society should control and use?" and I said "At the yard gate." I didn't mean by that that we were to fence off that little piece of land in the

sense that "possession" means now, but when you are collectively using and collectively managing those things that you have collectively made—I don't care on how small a scale it may be—because you ought to enlarge the scale on account of economy; when you have done that you have stopped the possibility of traffic and of profit and removed the effects that grow out of that kind of thing. So you draw the line at the imaginary line of the fence.

DEL. CARREY (Mass.): I have only a word to say upon the matter and I say it because, as a member of the Platform Committee, my position might be understood. I think, first, that we ought to confine ourselves to the question under discussion. We need light upon the relation of the Socialist movement towards the farmer and upon the question of land and land ownership.

I believe that I can make my position clear, and it is this: I recognize the fact that today, under capitalism, land is the property of the nation, and by the national laws the management or ownership is regulated. Today the nation permits individuals to hold titles to land, subject to conditions. One condition, for instance, is that they must pay taxes on that land. If they fail to pay taxes the nation takes it away from them and sells it to the next highest bidder.

The theory of national ownership of land is already affirmed by the present government. Now, then, what is the change that I wish should be made? If it is not specifically stated in the platform, it should be made clear. I understand the platform committee, and I mention it in relation to the proposition submitted by the Committee on Farmers, while recognizing the fact that the nation theoretically today is the owner of the land, and since the form of the industrial development in the agricultural districts is not such as to make the operation of all agricultural industry collective as yet, that while affirming the national ownership of land, permission is given to individuals to use that land on the basis of occupancy and use, but not to be used for exploitation.

Now, I do not know whether that is clear. Let me repeat it and conclude. Today, under capitalism, the ownership of land is vested in the nation. We cannot affirm it more clearly than it is already affirmed by the present government. I deny the present manner by

which the government allots the land to individuals through titles.

I say that the right position is that the ownership should be vested in the people collectively, the nation; second, the right to land should be determined by occupancy and use, and that that use should not carry with it the power of exploitation. This I understand to be the position of the Committee on Platform. If it is not, I, as a member of the committee, disagree with it. I do not believe that the resolution brought in by the majority of the Farmers' Committee expresses clearly that position, and hence I am opposed to it.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): If we are anything we are Socialists, and if we are Socialists we believe that ultimately this capitalist system will develop to a point whereby all means of production and distribution will be so centralized and so developed and so trustified that the Socialists will have very little trouble in managing them after they get them. Now, if the farmer, if the man who wishes land to use for himself, has a right to the use of that land, then it is also logical to suppose that I personally can at any time buy myself any machine of production any place in the world and use that machine for production for myself, and manufacture the goods I wish to manufacture for myself, sell them myself, and get what I can get for them and keep that for myself. It is ridiculous. It is reactionary. There is not a man on this floor who will admit that that industry, aside from the land question, will not develop and is not developing, is not trustifying.

No man will disagree with that, and if that is a fact, is it not also a fact that farms are being owned more and more by corporations, that homestead farming is becoming more and more a reality?

I make this point, that all industry is tending to trustification. We can all agree to that. I make the point also that farms are being trustified. I make the point, and I reiterate what another comrade has said before, in speaking for Oklahoma, that 87 per cent of the farmers in Oklahoma are at present working their farms either under a mortgage or by renting them. If that is true, that condition will not last very long.

DEL. PAYNE (Texas): If the Socialist movement stands for anything it

stands for the working class, the proletarian. The condition of the farmer today is exactly the same as that of the wage worker. The farmer may own his little piece of land and raise his products, but he does not finish production. Production is not finished until the product passes through all the different phases and is delivered at the door of the consumer.

The same things that stand between the wage earner and the finished product stand between the farmer and the finished product. The same things that stand between the wage earner and economic independence stand between the farmer and economic independence.

Take the farmers today; most of them are propertyless, most of them are landless. They, as well as the wage earner, want the social ownership of all the machinery of production. The farmer is exploited because all along the line from the farmer to the finished product stand the capitalists who have trustified these industries. They stand there, and when they pull the string the farmer out there dances to their tune, and he is just as dependent as the wage earner.

We stand for the collective ownership of capital, that which is used in wealth production, and I want to know if this convention of this movement which we call the great revolutionary movement is going to go down in history as catering to a small middle class of land owners, or are you going to stand for the great proletarian farming class? I would just as soon belong to the Hearst Rement, or the Roosevelt Reform element, or the Bryan element, and stand on their platform, as to stand on the one that has been offered here today.

As I understand it, under Socialism there will be no wage earners. As long as you have wages it means that the worker is exploited. Wages means that there is a surplus value that is paid in profits to somebody. As I understand it, we don't stand for any sort of wages whatever. We stand for the emancipation of the working class, and in doing that we stand for the collective ownership, not only of the means of wealth production and distribution, but also of the land.

In this great struggle do not forget the proletarian class. In the year 1900 only one per cent of the great working class owned their own homes. When I

hear them talk about Socialism taking away their homes I say it will not take them away from very many, because there are not many that have any. But Socialism would take the land away from nobody. But, as my friend over there has told you, the ownership of the land is already vested in the state. Socialism would simply take it and make it a different form, make it collective ownership.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I do not want to take up my entire five minutes, but I do want to say that I agree with Comrade Carey that by the theory of government today—and there are twenty lawyers on the floor of this convention who are class-conscious Socialists who will undoubtedly confirm this statement—the state, the sovereignty, has never relinquished its ownership of the land.

I agree with our brilliant and magnetic comrade from Texas who has just spoken, that the common people haven't got the land. I submit that the comrades who have spoken have all spoken to the same point, that we should declare to the farmers that we propose that the farmer whose present means of life is his interest in a certain tract of land will not be dumped out in the cold, like an Indian Territory renter when he cannot pay his rent.

I live in a state where one-ninth of the land is owned absolutely and the title vests in the state of Oklahoma. And if you will get into a buggy with me and drive out into the country, you need pass only one school section to be able to identify every other school section in the state; for no farmer ever turns an extra spadeful of dirt on that rented land, rented from the state of Oklahoma, that he don't have to turn. And you will find among the revolutionary, class-conscious Socialists out there that every one is fighting tooth and nail to get forty acres of land in fee. Now, Socialism proposes that until farming becomes co-operative, and so long as it is done on the present basis, that the man who is doing a piece of work shall have a place to put his feet while he is working. And I would like to have this Farmers' Committee agree to put in form this resolution that we of Oklahoma and we of Washington can all agree to, for we all want the same thing, that no man shall represent or no man understand that Socialism pro-

poses to rob him of what he now considers the essential of his life, a place to be employed.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): Now let us talk a little common sense. I will be brief, because I am not an orator nor a perorator, as I would be told by our proletarian comrades from the state where they know it all. Do you want to learn anything about municipal ownership? Ask Wisconsin. Do you want information about the farmer question? Wisconsin knows all about it. And all because they have got a few aldermen elected and some men doing legislative work.

DEL. THOMPSON: I object to the personalities.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I say simply that they are people who know it all, and I do not, but I do remember that four years ago some comrades from Wisconsin told us that they wanted a municipal program. They said, "How can we go to work in our municipalities and our legislatures unless we have a municipal program." We must have a municipal program." Somehow or other this question was submitted to the committee. I was doubtful at that time whether we needed a municipal program, but I concluded they were right. When I came here this time I expected, of course, to find them in the same frame of mind, but I find that the Wisconsin delegation say they don't want a municipal program. If they ask for an immigration resolution or a farmers' program, I will ask them to postpone consideration of the question for four years and refer it to a committee, and perhaps by that time they will have again reconsidered and they will say they don't want any farmers' program. If there is any farmer question in the state or any municipal question in the state, they can adopt any farmers' program to meet the situation.

Now, Comrade Thompson, for the majority of this committee comes before you with a certain first step towards a program, I would call it. They say they want certain things because that means "the raising of the standard of living of the wage-working class, which will inure to the benefit of the farming class." Now, if that is what Socialism means, I haven't studied Socialism. Then I must go to Wisconsin. I must forget all that I knew about Socialism and must learn it all anew. They say that the first step

towards Socialism, or words to that effect, is the socialization of the great industries, and then they tell us that the first step towards Socialism is to get rid of the landlord.

I favor the minority resolution with this exception: There is a phrase there which states that the farmer should join the party that stands for his class, or words to that effect. I move an amendment, or a substitute, to strike out the words "of his class" and substitute the words "of the working class," and then I will be satisfied to accept the minority report. (Seconded.)

This amendment was accepted by Delegate Barzee.

DEL. KNOPFENAGEL (Ill.): Once upon a time I was an impossibilist. I came over to this country with ideas that a farmer cannot be made to understand what Socialism means and what Socialism stands for. I have preached these ideas everywhere until some three or four years ago, when the state organizer of the state of Michigan first invited me to make a tour there. He sent me out among the farmers, much to my dissatisfaction.

When I came to the first farmer meeting I prepared myself, had all the fire ready, and began to talk as fiery, as I could; but I found out that I didn't talk fiery enough for the farmers. I found out that the farmers were more revolutionary than I was, and I considered myself more revolutionary than the American working class was. Then I came to the conclusion that if the Socialist party wants to have the farmers with them, whether the farmer has land or has no land, there is no need of referring to go before them with a strict revolutionary Socialist platform. You can go to him and explain to him the Socialist principles. Show him the relations between him as a farmer and the city working class; show him his dependence and the dependence of the working class upon the same common enemy, and he grasps it and he understands it, and you don't need to go to him with Utopias to be realized in the future.

Tell him in plain language that the Socialist party stands for the common ownership, not only of machinery, etc., but also of the land, and he is only too glad to give that ownership of land into the hands of the people, instead of having it under the mort-

gages of the capitalist class. Don't fear, comrades, to adopt the minority report as amended by Comrade Slobodin.

DEL. BERGER: There is no intention and no inclination on the part of the platform committee to deny that we stand for the common ownership of the land. I fully agree with Comrade Carey on this point. It is simply a question of how he expresses it. But there can be no doubt that evolution was different in the agricultural field, that centralization in land has not taken the same form as it did in industry.

In other words, the prediction of the Marxians that we would some day have centralized the small farms into big farms of one hundred thousand or a million acres has not come true.

We do not know that the future of agriculture is going to be. We do not know whether in the future agriculture will be conducted on a very large scale or whether the future of agriculture will be the intensive farming of very small tracts.

There is a great deal to be said on both sides. Just now it looks, with the inventions that are being made in the line of agricultural chemistry and in the use of electricity, that the future of agriculture will be intensive farming, and that some day three or four acres will be sufficient to supply a family with all its needs.

However, we are not going to make a platform or program for unborn generations. We are dealing with the problem as it is now. And the truth of the matter is that centralization has not taken place in agriculture, as it has in the field of industry.

Besides there is another phase of the question to be considered.

The process of manufacturing has been changed entirely by the inventions which took place in shop and factory. It has not only separated the producer from the product; it has not only separated the man who uses the instruments from ownership of these instruments, but it has also changed the entire process.

That is not the case in farming. There the introduction of the machine has not changed the entire process of agriculture. And it has not separated the owner of the farm from the farm. If you will look at the census, you will find the average size of farms in America was about 139 acres in 1880, then

it went down to 134 in 1890, and then it went up again to 138 acres in 1900. The average size of the farms has practically remained stationary during the last thirty years. It is true that there are more tenant farmers now than we ever had before, but that is due to the fact, that down South after the slave barons had been defeated, they divided up their big plantations and rented many small parcels to the negroes. That has changed the general average somewhat, so that is, there are more tenant farmers.

There is also the fact to be considered, that one can still get land in western states, for instance Wisconsin, at \$5 an acre, but, of course, it is wild land. You can get better land out west for \$10 and \$15 an acre. In short, the question is not the same in the field of agriculture, is not the same as in the field of industry.

Let us look at these things as they are. We do not want to be carried away by revolutionary phrases and hot air. We cannot solve this problem by talking loud and long. We will have to solve it according to experience and the results of scientific research.

However, comrades, as I said, we are dealing with a question of today. I am willing to incorporate a phrase some thing like what Comrade Berger of Texas suggested. It could be added to paragraph 4, where we are dealing with land and ought to read, "Occupancy and use to be the sole basis for any title." That phrase did not originate with me. That was an old plank I found in the platform of the Knights of Labor, and I think it is a very good clause to add.

DEL MORRISON (Ariz.): I never thought it would be necessary for me or any one else who is devoted to the cause of revolutionary socialism, to oppose a report like the one presented before the chairman of the Farmers' Committee. I have never supposed that a thing like this could ever possibly occur in a Socialist convention. If it was a Single Tax convention, if it was a Bryan or a Hearst meeting, if it was a Roosevelt Reform Society, or something of that character, I would not be surprised; but to think that you, as delegates of the great revolutionary party are called upon to pass away your time in convincing this bourgeois Wisconsin crowd (laughter drowned balance of this sentence). I am not trying to be smart or anything of that sort; but I want to call your at-

tention to the fact that in the year 1888 the Populists held their national convention in this same windy city, and the same sort of stuff that is interjected here by the chairman of this Farmers' Committee, was covered by the platform of that Populist convention. Is it possible that we have so far forgotten ourselves that we will attempt to carry favor with a few capitalist farmers? Why is this resolution here? What is the object of it? What is the purpose of it? Is it to secure votes? Do you hope to deceive someone as to the actual, real program of scientific socialism? Or are you in other words, going to lie to the farmers of this country in order to secure their suffrage? Are you going to present something to them that you know is not contained in the Socialist program? Can you afford as representatives of this great revolutionary party, to do that which in a few years you will be ashamed of? I say no. And you, when you vote upon this resolution, will answer no, because you will adopt the minority report.

The time is past, when we are called upon to play with words, with catch phrases for the purpose of securing the recognition of one petty class here and another petty class there. The time has passed when we should dally with words and phrases. We are called upon to mark out a straight line and follow it, and hence to it, like the chips fall where they will.

DEL LEE (N. Y.): I desire to speak against the minority report, but I must say at the same time that I am compelled to speak as well,—or at least to vote as well, against the majority report. I don't believe, comrades, after having listened to the reports and to the discussion here today that we would as well to adopt either of these reports. I don't believe we are in a position today to take action upon the question of the Farmers' Program.

In Germany and France and the various countries of Europe, our comrades have given careful study to the agrarian question. They have appointed their committees which have worked for months and for years and have worked out farmers' programs. It has not impugned the revolutionary character of the party in France that they have had a farmers' program, or of the German Social Democracy because they have a farmers' program.

It is right that the Socialist party should know what it is going to do in the matter of the men who work upon the soil and that it should be able to tell them what it is going to do; and I think it is not in place for delegates on either side to charge that the other side is trying to cater for votes. Our Farmers' Programs are only an attempt at a solution of what is going to be the method of handling the land and using it under the Co-operative Commonwealth. I don't think we are ready to answer that question.

I think we ought to have a farmers' program in the real sense of the word, a program of measures in line with our other programs, a program setting forth the measures that the Socialist party is willing to support in order that the wage-working class and the working farmer class may come together for the reorganization of society upon a right basis. Such a program as that I should like to see. Such a program that we do not have before us in either of these reports, and I, for one, shall vote against both; and if there should be any opportunity for the election of a committee that should study the question, I should be in favor of it.

DEL KAPLAN (Minn.): I want to say that both sides seem to me to be somewhat in error. When we say "Proletariat of the world, unite!" we do not merely mean the wage-workers of the world. Wage earners and farmers are both producers. If we take the position that the proletariat means the wage-earners of the world, then we are today hopelessly in the minority, and will remain in the minority, for this reason: We know that between 40 and 50 per cent of the wage workers of the country will never be converted to Socialism. Marx tells us that we have nothing to hope for from the slum proletariat. I am not taking the position that because of that we are to look down upon them. The fact is that in all of our great centers of population all over the country you find a great mass of the wage-earners hopelessly degenerate, hopelessly brainless, hopelessly destitute, as a result of their condition and environment. On the other hand there is what we might call the aristocracy of labor. When the Western Federation of Miners went on strike, some were asking for \$2 and \$2.25 a day, while others were getting \$8, \$9 and \$10 a day,

and these latter ones said that the others didn't deserve any more. There are those two foes to the working class,—the fools who are below and the fools who are up on top, both of whom will never be converted. So, let us recognize once for all that we have got to have the farmer and we have got to have the wage-worker. But we do not want to harmonize with the farmer from the standpoint of a middle class proposition. The farmer must recognize that the dollar question is his question, and that his question is our question. That is what the minority proposition means. Proletarians of the world, unite, upon the basis of the working class emancipation, for the emancipation of working class society.

DEL THOMPSON (Wis.): I want to speak for the committee. I want to call attention to the fact that this resolution which the majority has reported does not pretend to be a platform. It is simply for the purpose of clearing up one point that is now under discussion. The convention has already agreed to the election of a committee to study this question. That was a part of the committee's previous report, and it is now for the convention to elect such a committee.

I want to say in defence of the resolution of the committee, in regard to the point that Comrade Berger brought out, viz., that occupancy and use should constitute the only real title to the possession of the land. That is what I believe every member of the majority of the committee had in mind,—so much so that if I had gotten the opportunity to offer the amendment, I would gladly have presented it and I believe all the committee would accept it. It is exactly our idea.

We know that there is a very large proportion of the votes of this country on the farm, under agricultural conditions and environment, over 40 per cent. Less than 30 per cent of the votes of this country are under industrial conditions. When we get to the point where we want to do something, we must have some way or other of getting these two forces welded together. We never can win out with 30 per cent of the vote. We will have to have at least a substantial majority, and that, we cannot have without the farmers.

DEL. DOWNIE (Wash.): They have talked to you a good deal about

the difference in trustification of industry in manufacture and industry in agriculture. Simons, in his book "The American Farmer," points out the reason why the trustification in agriculture has not taken the same course as it has in manufacture. And why hasn't it taken the same course? One of the principle reasons he points out lies in the fact that the farmer and his wife and his family working together can produce and put on the market farm products in competition with a higher state of production. Now, I ask you, comrades, do you stand for any such condition as this degradation and lack of opportunity on the part of the children of the rural communities. I tell you, comrades, we are just as much opposed to children working on farms as we are to children working in the factories, and we stand to abolish the present system of production. Just one more point I want to make, and that is this—we have to take into consideration the different conditions that will underlie future action, as contrasted with the conditions our present action faces. When we get Socialism the conditions will be so changed that it will be impossible to have private production for sale to be seriously considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is now upon the adoption of the minority report as read. All in favor please say aye; contrary no. The chair is in doubt. A division is called for.

A vote was then taken by show of hands, resulting in 99 votes for and 51 against. The minority report was declared adopted.

The committee was relieved from further duty.

Nominations were made for the Permanent Farmers' Committee and voting deferred until the ballots could be printed.

#### REPORT OF PLATFORM COMMITTEE RESUMED.

THE CHAIRMAN: When we adjourned at noon, the previous question had been called for on the adoption of the first clause of the immediate demands. Comrades Cannon of Arizona, Cole of California, Work of Iowa, and Furman of New York had spoken on the question when the

chair declared the convention adjourned at 12:30. The question comes on the substitution of the word "collective" for the word "national." All you in favor of substituting the word "collective" for the word "national," signify by saying aye; contrary no. The ayes seem to have it. They have it, and it is so ordered.

Now the question comes upon the adoption of the first amendment introducing the words "and all land" prior to the word "railroads." Are you ready for the question?

Question called for; motion put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now comes upon the adoption of the report of the committee in its amended form.

The vote was taken by a show of hands, and the proposition as amended was adopted by a vote of 102 to 33.

The next paragraph was then read as follows:

"2. The national ownership of all industries which are organized on a national scale and in which competition has virtually ceased to exist."

DEL. BOOMER: I move to amend by substituting the word "collective" for the word "national."

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the committee accept the amendment?

DEL. SIMONS: I would, but I haven't the right to act for the committee.

The motion to substitute the word "collective" for the word "national" in the second paragraph was then put and carried.

Motion to adopt the paragraph as amended was put and carried.

The next paragraph was then read as follows:

"3. The extension of the public domain, to include mines, quarries, all wild forests and water power." There being no objection, the section was adopted.

Paragraph 4 was then read as follows:

"4. The scientific reforestation of timber lands and the reclamation of swamp lands, all lands so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain."

DEL. CLARK (Texas): I have an amendment that I believe will settle

all this controversy. I want to amend it by letting this clause appear at the beginning: "Occupancy and use of land to be the sole title to its possession."

DEL. SIMONS: I will read it with your amendment: "Occupancy and use of land to be the sole title of possession. The scientific reforestation of timber land and the reclamation of swamp lands. Lands so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain." You will have to straighten that out.

DEL. CLARK: At the meeting of the platform committee it was agreed that something of this kind should go on there.

DEL. SIMONS: It seems to me, as I understand it, that that is superfluous. It is putting the same thing in twice, and confusing the language.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have it now, Comrade Simons.

DEL. SIMONS: It was just as I stated it, as they wanted it.

DEL. HILLQUIT: It makes sense.

DEL. CLARK: The purpose I aimed at was to amend it just as this is. The other was the committee's. I didn't know what the committee might do. I might just say I suggested this as the way I saw to settle it. I make this because I believe it will settle all this controversy that we have had. In the talk I made this morning against the proposition, the clause reported by the committee, I did so for the reason that I took a different position relative to the national ownership and collective ownership of these industries. You might say it is making a fine distinction between these two terms, but the terms suits me better. It may be simply a way of qualifying things, but I like the term better, and that is why I make the fight. It may be possible that in taking that position I am an idle dreamer. I want to plead guilty to that fact. I want to say again, I will just answer an objection that was made this morning when I said the dreams that nations dream come true; if more of you men become dreamers we will get along with this better than we do. We have been accused of being Utopian, but I want to say that if you succeed in trying

to poke these reforms down the throats of the Socialists of this country in this convention, you will face a storm in your ranks four years from now, when they attempt to undo it.

As far as I am concerned I am sorry that the question of the collective ownership of wooden shoes should have come into the question, but it seems that every time a man gets on the floor and takes a certain position on Socialism it is accused of believing in the collective ownership of tooth brushes. It is preposterous and absurd, and Comrade Simons knew I made no such declaration and said I had no such purpose. Get that clear in your mind. No man that had an eye single to the principle of the statement here would have made that accusation. I stand here for revolutionary Socialism, and I am glad to say that though my position was criticised, I still maintain that position, and any individual who stands for mere reform has no place, or lot in a revolutionary Socialist convention. (Applause.)

I said that when I came here I came to take the land, and I meant that statement, and that if it came to a point of voting I would vote to down every reform that was proposed in this program, but I say again that I said that for peace and harmony I want to ask you to agree on a program that we could all endorse, but if this convention decided differently I shall stand by it after adoption and I shall support it just as faithfully as any of you when I leave the convention. I stand for that as amended here, and I hope that ends the controversy as far as I am concerned.

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I would like to ask, as long as you put a clause as to the land in the first section, why we need to deal with these specializations on the land at all. It seems to me, as long as you amended the clause to include all lands, that you might just as well cut off all the other specializations. I don't see any use in specializing about different kinds of prairie land, etc., as it is all land.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I want to speak for this amendment, and in doing so I would like to ask the comrade from Texas one question. If I understand the meaning of



this amendment as he now presents it, he wants to make it state that occupancy and use of land is the only title to possession. Do I understand that, comrade?

DEL. CLARK (Tex.): Yes, the basis of title.

DEL. THOMPSON: Now, I want to know from Comrade Clark, do you guarantee under that the farmer in the possession of that land?

DEL. CLARK: Certainly, we guarantee that possession.

DEL. HILLQUIT: A point of information. I would like to know if Comrade Clark and Comrade Thompson have agreed between themselves, what guaranty have they that the co-operative commonwealth will fulfill the promise?

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) The question is now first upon adopting the amendment that Comrade Clark submitted.

DEL. BAUER (Cal.): I wish to speak against this long-eared amendment. We have just voted and declared for the collective ownership of all land. Now we are going to reverse our position and vest title to land in occupancy and use, which is the old anarchist position; it is not the Socialist position. (Applause, and a voice, "Correct.") I actually thought we had a convention of intelligent men here, but we absolutely go on record for one specific thing, and then the next moment go in direct opposition to the previous position. Where do we stand? Occupancy and use certainly would give private ownership to men who own 1,537,000 acres of land, and the land owned by corporations, merely because they say they occupy and use every foot of that land. Nonsense. We stand for collective ownership, and the title rests with the collectivity. (Applause.) No two-by-four farmer and no financial farmer or anybody else. How are you going to determine what he occupies and what he uses? Are you going to have a special committee to say that you occupy and use so much land? If he chooses he can occupy every foot of land that he wants. That is the old anarchist position and not the Socialist position, and I hope in the name of logic and common

sense you will exercise your intelligence and vote this fool amendment down. (Applause.)

DEL. Fieldman of New York moved the previous question, and it was seconded and carried.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I rise to a question of information that will keep us from getting into a hole. I want to ask Comrade Clark of Texas if he won't consent to some such arrangement of words as this; otherwise I will say that we are going to have something that will sound rather silly when we get it out. I want to read this just as we have got it, on which we are going to vote: "Occupancy and use to be the sole title of possession. The scientific reforestation of timber land and the reclamation of swamp land. Lands so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain." I would strike out the first and last clauses. Permit me to make a suggestion that we do this: Pick out the clause and make the whole thing read like this, leaving out part of the committee's report: "4. The scientific reforestation of timber land and the reclamation of swamp lands; occupancy and use of such land to be the sole title to possession." Stop right there.

DEL. CLARK: I am sure the comrades here fully understand the position I am taking in that matter, and if that do we will all agree. The position is this. As to the Wisconsin delegation, or those who vote for the platform as it has been stated, my conception of their position is this: That when we stand for the private ownership of lands as it was embodied there it means that the individual shall own his land privately and be protected by a title from the political state. My position is that he will not be protected by a title from a political state, but from an industrial government, as you have wiped out the national ownership of that land. Understand, you don't vote for that if you know what the difference between industrial and national administration means, from my standpoint.

DEL. SLAYTON: A point of order. I object to any change of the

report of the committee after the previous question has been called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: Objection has been offered, and the vote will be upon the amendment. Del. Hillquit has the floor.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I will ask you to vote against the amendment, and kindly be careful hereafter in voting on the amendment. We do not realize here for the moment that when we adopt this phrase or these words we take something that we must explain for four years more, and something that we may not be able to explain. I think before we make a laughing stock of ourselves we should take the time to consider that the more immediate demands are temporary measures. With the collective ownership of all lands we have mixed up our program, and it will tack this phrase on to something which, first, has no connection with the title to land, only, is an entirely unfounded assumption. What does the amendment mean? Occupancy and use the basis of title to land. How do we know whether the co-operative commonwealth will infer and arrange it in that way? Are we authorized to make that statement? Are we called upon to make that statement? Is it revolutionary, scientific Socialism, or is it an individual solution of anyone who happens to think that we can provide for legal rights in that way? Aren't we taking a long excursion into the domain of the future and not into the realm of speculation? It may be true that the dream of the dreamer may become a reality if this dream is the dream of the nation. But we have not come here to dream dreams and leave it to the future to realize them or to show them to be just mere pipe dreams. We have come here for some reason, and I think there is no reason which would justify us in taking this position and making this a part of our immediate demands. The Socialist state may just as well decide upon an entirely different basis for the distribution of land. It may not at all be bound by our resolution here today that occupancy and use forms a title. They may have other modes of establishing title or regulating the use of land. We have set forth in our main platform that we stand for the collec-

tive ownership of land, and have stated there plainly, as far as language is concerned, that every foot of the globe should be exempt from the absolute ownership of the people. (Applause.) We have put that in our main platform; then we have put it in our immediate demands; then comes a second demand creating another sort of land. Leave it alone. We have got enough to think of.

DEL. WALDHORST (Ala.): I am for the immediate demands as submitted by the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then against the amendment?

DEL. WALDHORST: In our platform we declare in one place in the preamble a certain position, and then in the platform proper we state again a certain position, and then we come to the immediate demands which have prevailed in all Socialist platforms to my knowledge, for the last twenty years, wherever they have had a chance to publish any. Now, in the immediate demands we declare a position against that which we have already stated in the preamble and in the platform. What are we after? If we don't want to state these positions over and over again, then we don't need any immediate demands. What of it? That is all nonsense. Now, any Socialist that will say that the title to land lies in occupancy, I don't know where he got that idea from. I never got any like that. My idea always was that when we get the Socialist state there will be the title to land. Not only that, Herbert Spencer stated, and if you will read his book on title to land, you will find the explanation of my position. I never heard of such a thing. If you want to declare that title to land shall be occupancy and use, it is single taxism and not Socialism. (Applause.) I do not recognize any title to anything except what is absolutely necessary for my personal and individual demands and for my family. And no more do I believe in the collective ownership of a tooth brush that is mine and I own it—or any other proposition of that kind. But I say this: I believe there was and there is no title to any land whatever, and never was. (Applause.) Just the same as it is necessary for me to own my

plane and my saw that I can follow my trade, just as much as it is absolutely necessary for the community or the nation to own the land from which and on which they raise the necessities of life. Now, if you go ahead and state these propositions over and over again, then the comrade from Texas better study Marx over, and better study Herbert Spencer and Ruskin, too. I studied them all. I have been at it for twenty-seven years, and I found out I know less now than I did when I started. (Laughter.) But I know this, that the philosophy of Socialism rests on a very simple proposition, and that is that all things necessary to the human race as a social being or a nation or a community must be owned and should be owned by that nation or community or whatever you may call it; the source of it must be owned socially and collectively. The distinction between national and collective is a good deal if you study it. Not only that, but immediate demands are a thing that is permitted by Socialists of all countries. For what reason? To give them a chance to ameliorate the conditions as they exist today and not under a Socialist state. We want to make the conditions so that we can raise the man from down in the slum up to a position where he will be able physically, mentally and morally to understand the position of the Socialist that wants to give him a full chance to employ that which we call the joys of life. (Applause.)

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I wish to speak for the amendment. Comrades, I haven't any voice or strength to waste, so I must ask you to listen carefully. I am a revolutionary Socialist. (Applause.) Now, understand that, and please don't take my time in applause. I am simply stating things clearly. I am not bidding for applause; that is not what I want. I am so much of a revolutionary Socialist that I am going to quote with approval the words of Karl Kautsky, who, with Bebel, stands as one of the leaders of the revolution—if you please, the leader of the revolution in the south of Germany. Is that satisfactory?

A DELEGATE: No.

DEL. GAYLORD: That depends

on what you are thinking about. Kautsky is known as a "r-r-revolutionary." (Applause.) I want to read him. He says, "No Socialist who is to be taken seriously has ever demanded that farmers should be expropriated." Do you understand that? This I quote from page 159 of the "Socialist Revolution" by Kautsky.

A DELEGATE: Read the rest.

DEL. GAYLORD: The whole book? No, I haven't got time. I read that a long while ago; that is why I can turn to it so easily. I have given the page, and you have to take my word. I am making this speech myself, if you please. Now, we have come to the point where we recognize the necessity of discussing and studying this land question. That is a long step forward, and I am glad to see it. I want you to watch the vote in favor of this line of study and in favor of going forward in this way. Some one said here that the German comrades are behind the times. That is very interesting; it is almost cute.

A DELEGATE: You will be, by reading that book.

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes, I should say so.

A DELEGATE: May I ask a question?

DEL. GAYLORD: I am not going to stop till I get through. I am in order, and there is nothing the matter but you. (Laughter.) Comrades, I have not time to read, but I want you to suggest to you that you can find three different sets of agrarian or what we call agricultural programs; one drafted by a committee in which Bebel is a member for Northern Germany; another by a committee in which Dr. Quarek is a member from Central Germany; and another by a committee in which Von Vollmar, who is one of the so-called Bernsteinian comrades, is from Southern Germany. I may get them mixed up, but the point I want to make is that in Germany there are three different kinds, just as in this country there are at least three. Coming back to the point at issue, I am not quite clear whether this ought to be put in a separate section or left in this section, and I do not care. But I want it embodied, because it agrees with Kautsky who is revolutionary; it

agrees also with the comrades who are constructive. There are points where the revolutionary Socialists who say it with a "r-r-revolutionary" and those who are constructive, or, if you please, opportunists—there are points where they agree in all the international movement. This is one of the points. Therefore, I want that sentence included in these demands somewhere, and so I am in favor of the amendment. Put it in here, or put it in a separate section, I do not care, but put it in because it belongs there.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of adopting the amendment will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no. The noes appear to have it; the noes have it. Now the proposition in its original form. All you that favor the same will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, if any. It is carried.

Section 5 of the general demands was read as follows:

5. The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage, as guaranteed by the constitution.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I move to strike out the word "absolute." There is either freedom of the press or there is none. I don't believe there is any absolute freedom, and then freedom.

DEL. SIMONS: I think the word is used there simply as an emphazier. I do not believe that as such it is out of the way.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): I want to ask Del. Simons a question. What guaranty can you give us that we have got a constitution?

DEL. SIMONS: That is a question for the supreme court.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any objection to the section as read?

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I would like to ask a question first, and make a remark if I am allowed. Is a motion necessary to do what Comrade Hoehn wanted?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair would decide that in editing that would be taken care of.

DEL. SLAYTON: Then I want words that say "as guaranteed by the constitution." I will tell you why when it is in order. (Seconded.)

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I would like to ask the delegate from Pennsylv-

vania if he has any words to submit in place of that?

DEL. SLAYTON: We don't want any words in place of it. Will Comrade Simons please read it as it would stand with the words stricken out by my amendment proposes, and I will explain.

DEL. SIMONS: "Absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage." It is absolutely guaranteed in the constitution in almost those words, and the idea was to have it preserved.

DEL. SLAYTON: I wish to speak on the motion.

DEL. SIMONS: The committee will accept that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then it is adopted. Proceed.

## DEBATE ON RELIGION.

Del. Simons read the next section: 6. That religion be treated as a private matter—a question of individual conscience.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I wish to make a motion and speak to it. I move that this part be stricken out of the platform. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved that that part be stricken from the platform. Are you ready for the question? Comrade Lewis of Illinois has the floor.

DEL. LEWIS: Comrade Chairman and comrade delegates: I am among those who sincerely hoped the question of religion would not be raised at this convention. I am willing to concede so far that we shall let sleeping dogs lie. (Applause.) I know that the Socialist position in philosophy on the question of religion does not make a good campaign subject. It is not useful in the propaganda of a presidential campaign, and therefore I am willing that we should be silent about it. But if we must speak I propose that we shall go before this country with the truth and not with a lie. (Applause.) I believe in Socialist scholarship, and I voted to have scholars on this Platform Committee in that sense; men who understand the Socialist philosophy, and we have at least half a dozen men on the Platform Committee who know that the question of religion is a sociological question; it is an anthropological

question; it is a question of chronology; it is a question of economics; it is a question of theology. There are few domains of modern thought that do not directly affect the question of religion. And when you say that it is merely a question of private conscience, you fly in the face of the science and the learning of your day. (Applause.)

Now, I do not propose to state in this platform the truth about religion from the point of view of the Socialist philosophy as it is stated in almost every book of Standard Socialist literature; but if we do not do that, let us at least have the good grace to be silent about it and not make hypocrites of ourselves. (Applause.) I have only one copy of this standard, recognized book. I have not access to my library at this distance, and I borrowed it from Comrade Miller. It is Karl Kautsky. He says: "So long as Christianity ruled the minds of men the idea of revolution was rejected as sinful, as a sinful revolt against divinely constituted authority." But you must not go before the people of this country in this campaign telling them that so long as Christianity rules their minds they will reject the idea of social revolution. Oh, no, you must not be revolutionary, Comrade Gaylord; you must tell them they can be good Christians and accept the revolution as not being sinful, but quite in harmony with divinely constituted authority. I say, let us either tell the truth or have the good grace and the common sense and the stamina and the manhood and the self respect to keep our mouths shut about it. Therefore I move that this be stricken from the platform. (Applause.)

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.): Comrade Chairman, I do hope that this clause can be stricken out. It ought to be stricken out without any objection, without any discussion. But as Comrade Lewis has said he hoped the question of religion would not be brought up, well, he started it by making the speech he made.

DEL. LEWIS: It was because it was in the platform.

DEL. D'ORSAY: Well, it could be obviated by not discussing it. The question of religion in the highest

sense is a question of individual conscience, and if we would leave it out of our platform altogether the question of religion would adjust itself, and I do not think we have any right to bring up the question of religion in the Socialist platform. And another reason it ought not to be in there is that it is not a demand. If it was and if it had a place anywhere it belongs in our declaration of principles. And I think on the whole question of immediate demands, if we would stick to the general demands and not go into specialization or special positive things, it would be much better. But you see we come in with a certain lot of immediate demands, and then we don't know where we are at. We go into everything, and therefore we must cover every part of the Socialist philosophy.

DEL. MILA TUPPER MAYNARD (Col.): Comrades, we are really anxious to have working class solidarity by the revolutionary victory, or are we anxious to air our special theories of religion or intolerance? Can we seriously say that a movement that must be world wide must accept some particular form of materialistic, monistic, any kind of a negative position, or any kind of a positive position, for that matter? Those of us who are Socialists and who read with reverence and respect the words of a Ferri and a Kautsky, do not quarrel with them because they do not understand all of them, we do. We do not take their statements on economic matters and say they are false because they happen to develop a crude and childish idea of God and do not believe in that kind of a god. I say that the German Socialists, the foreign Socialists altogether, so far as I know, all of them, those who express themselves on religion, have a perfectly ignorant and utterly childish notion of modern theological thought, and I for myself have always stated that I stood against any rabid religious position or any kind of religious position or denominationalism, but I do say that I think that modern cosmic theism is as much more profound than this childish monism as can possibly be imagined. The Socialist philosophy is the best bulwark that was ever

made for a genuine cosmic theism. I would not believe there was any divinity or goodness in the world or any meaning in the world if it were not for the fact that Socialism interprets all this great cosmic problem. It interprets it in such terms as are consistent with the thought of a Tyndall, with the thought of a Huxley and with the thought of a Spencer. It is absolutely consistent. And when this atheism is made to appear identical with Socialism, those who so try to identify are trying to put an impediment in the way of our progress which is utterly inexcusable. Can we accept the position of the Hindoo? Perhaps not. Possibly if we knew as much as they do we would accept it. But can we accept the position of the Mohammedans? We do not know much about it. But are we going to try to have international solidarity on the basis of some theory or what some other man ought to believe if he don't? I object to people putting up some crude notion that existed a hundred years ago and saying it is the religion of my brother Christians or my brother workmen who are Christians, and then knocking it down and saying that a man cannot be a Socialist if he accepts it. I believe the people who take this position know neither the philosophy of modern religion nor do they understand the real cosmic significance of Socialism. (Applause.)

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): The Socialist Party has not thus far concerned itself with the particular religious opinions of its members, and consequently I have no pet theories or other views to advertise. But I do say that I consider this plank in our platform of immediate demands as a most unnecessary one, to say the least. (Applause.) I take it that these immediate demands express our views of things that we want to have as steps to the co-operative commonwealth, and I respectfully submit that as far as the government of this land is concerned religion is already treated as a private matter, and there is no use in asking that something be treated as a private matter with the individual when it already is the case. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I

move the following amendment. I move, in the first clause read to you, the insertion of this: "The Socialist movement is primarily an economic and political movement. It is not concerned with the institutions of marriage or religion." And I move that after its adoption it be taken out from the program and inserted in the declaration of principles. (Seconded.) The motion has been seconded, and I will say a few words to it. The very fact that there are Comrade Maynard and myself in the audience in opposite views on religion, she believing in the cosmic theism, I being an agnostic and always having been one, and both of us being nevertheless good and useful members of the Socialist Party, proves to you that religion is not connected with Socialism either for or against it. (Applause.) Yes, comrades, you would make a mistake. The fact that Comrade Lewis as a scholar, as a student of psychology, of history, of ethics and of everything else, has in the domain of religion come to the position of an agnostic and that ninety-nine per cent of us have landed in the same spot, does not make Socialism agnostic, nor is Socialism Christian, nor is Socialism Jewish. Socialism hasn't anything to do with that side of our existence at all. (Applause.) I say to you, Comrades, if we are to follow Comrade Lewis' advice and to say in our platform and declaration of principles what is true, let us not be afraid to insert in it the things we are advocating day after day and on all occasions. The trouble with us is that we have not always the courage of our convictions. I am confident that those who have applauded most emphatically, most noisily these utterances against the adoption of this plank, when they find themselves on the soap box and are asked the question, "Yes, but won't your Socialism destroy religion?" They will answer, "No, we don't agree on it. I personally may not be religious, but Socialism has nothing to do with religion." And to show you how widespread this conception is, I will tell you one little incident. I had the great pleasure of meeting in debate recently a college professor of extraordinary erudition in social science, more than

the average. He said distinctly, "The reason why I object to Socialism is because it is against marriage and religion." And I say to you, we have no right, especially after the subject has been brought up, to leave an impression among the people at large that Socialism stands for these things, for it does not stand against religion, or against marriage. Our comrades in Germany have the courage to say so openly. Let us have the same courage. (Applause.)

DEL. UENTERMANN (Idaho): Comrades, no one will accuse me with any sympathy with Christianity, either as a church or as a religion. I am known in the United States as a materialist of the most uncompromising order. But I want it clearly understood that my materialist philosophy does not permit me to strike this plank out of the platform. (Applause.) I want it understood that my materialist dialectics do not permit me to forget the exigencies of the moment for our ideals in the far future.

The Socialist platform in Germany has carried this very same plank for years, and the man who wrote it was the most uncompromising materialist in Germany, Karl Kautsky. (Applause.) Karl Marx and Frederic Engels surely were known as uncompromising Socialists, and they agreed with this platform. Would you expect to go out among the people of this country, people of different churches, of many different religious factions, and tell them that they must become atheists before they can become Socialists? That would be nonsense. We must first get these men convinced of the rationality of our economic and political program, and then after we have made Socialists of them and members of the Socialist Party, we can talk to them inside of our ranks, talk of the higher philosophy and of the logical consequences of our explanation of society and nature.

I know very well that this plank will be misconstrued into the very opposite of what we want to accomplish by it. I know that those who are opposed to the materialist's interpretation of history, will construe it into a prohibition of the teaching of all materialist philosophy in the So-

cialist movement. But we object to that interpretation, as they do the position of Comrade Lewis. (Applause.) We want to be consistent and conclusive in our teaching. We do not think that we can interpret society and nature analytically and naturally in economics, and theologically in philosophy. We believe that there is only one method by which we can get at all this stuff in the world in all things, and that is by the inductive, analytical method of historical materialism. And therefore we should interpret the facts of history as well as of nature from the standpoint of the materialist proletarian monism, but we should not go out in our propaganda among people that are as yet unconvinced and are still groping in ignorance and obscurity, and tell them that they first must become materialists before they can become members of the Socialist Party. No. This declaration that religion is a private matter does not mean that it is not a social matter, or class matter at the same time. It merely means that we shall bide our good time and wait till the individual is ready, through his own individual evolution, to accept our philosophy. It means that we shall give him plenty of time to grow gradually to the things that are essential to him, and those material things that affect his material welfare, the economic and political questions of Socialism. After he has grown into them it will be so much easier to approach him with the full consequences of the Socialist philosophy. Therefore, I ask you to retain this plank in our platform.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): Upon this matter I wish to say as a member of the Committee on Platform, that reference to religious matters and religious institutions occurred in various portions of various drafts that were submitted to us. My personal view was that all reference to such matters should have been stricken out, no matter what my own opinions might be, and no matter what my religious convictions might be. There is none of your business. I do not consider that my religious views have anything to do with the struggle of the proletariat for economic liberty, and because I so viewed the matter,

I deemed it unwise to have the matter brought up, knowing the temper of some of the delegates, and thought it better that there should be no reference whatever to the subject in the platform.

Some of it was stricken out, although some of the members of the committee saw fit to call me a coward for asking that it be not referred to. But we have troubles enough now; I want Socialism. I don't want to force upon the public, or upon the working class, a discussion of some abstract philosophy that will obscure the question of the emancipation of my class. And those who do want to force that discussion may be scientific, but it is not the science of the proletariat. For that reason I say that it is unhappy—and it was not the working class members of the committee who would have it there. It was the intellectuals—the literary men—

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): A point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Carey must be permitted to speak his mind. He has the floor.

DEL. LEWIS: The comrade pointed directly at me.

DEL. CAREY: Excuse me; I didn't mean you. (Laughter.) It is unfortunate that when I sweep my finger round the hall some place in the inclusiveness of this space is occupied by Comrade Lewis.

This is all I wish to say. Unfortunately this subject was brought up. It was unwise. But we must now act upon it. I say now pass this declaration that religion is not a public matter; my religion is no concern of you; yours is no concern of mine. That the subject was brought up was unhappy; but it is here; and I believe religion to be a private matter. I have a right to believe in the existence of a Heaven or a God. I am as good a Socialist, so far as I am concerned, as I can be. Therefore I shall vote for the adoption of the part which declares religion to be a private matter, although I believe it was unwise on the part of the committee to force us into a discussion of the matter, a matter that tends to obscure the issue in which I am interested, the abolition of economic tyranny, and the

emancipation of my class from industrial exploitation.

DEL. FARRELL (O.): While the previous speaker spoke in opposition to the amendment he spoke in favor of the adoption of the resolution as submitted by the committee. I want to say that I am here to speak in favor of leaving out the whole thing, and in opposition to both the resolution and the amendment.

It is my personal experience that the question of religion brought into our movement by the enemies of Socialism has tended to retard our movement more than any other question. On top of that I want to say that the resolution in my opinion was bad enough, but the amendment submitted by Comrade Hillquit in my opinion is ten times worse. I want to say to you that in my humble opinion the time has arrived when this question of religion will serve to retard the Socialist progress in far less degree than it has in the past. I want to say to you that in my opinion the best thing you can do is to vote down both the resolution as submitted by the committee and the amendment of Comrade Hillquit. Cut out the question of religion altogether.

I know that there have been men of practically every denomination known on the American continent in my local and the question of religion has been discussed, and it has not benefited us one bit. What we are here for is Socialism, for the emancipation of the working class, and eventually of the whole human race in the industrial field. I say to you then that it has been easier in the past for the speakers and agitators for Socialism to answer the opposition when they brought in the question of religion simply to say that Socialism has nothing to do with religion. Now let us continue along that line. I hold that if the matter is left in the program in that way it will tend to intensify the argument on religion, and in that way will tend to divert the discussion from the real issue and delay the emancipation of the working class and the emancipation of the race.

For those reasons I am opposed to both the resolution as submitted by

the committee and the amendment, and I hope this convention will be prudent and wise enough to vote down both of them.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): Probably I shall not use all my time if you give me your attention.

A DELEGATE: I hope not, Brown.

DEL. BROWN: I thank you. We cannot afford to evade anything as scientists. It is no answer to say that this is something with which we want nothing to do. If we mention a question, if the question is put to us, we have something to do with it as Socialists. As scientific Socialists if you cannot face the gun and answer the question you have no business upon the platform.

Now, as a matter of fact, we have something to do with both religion and with marriage. But our religion, in so far as we have to do with it, is our own individual private business. If any Socialist believes that the Socialist philosophy does not deal with the question of marriage, let him look at the 600,000 women in this country who would love to be married.

DEL. STRICKLAND: The question before us is not understood by the speaker. The question of marriage has been taken out.

DEL. BROWN: I accept the correction. I didn't know it was taken out.

The question of religion is a personal, private matter. It has something to do with the question of Socialism inasmuch as those people in this country who believe that the triumph of Socialism will destroy their religious beliefs should be disillusioned. Their minds need our attention. Because as a matter of fact we know that a person must almost necessarily be a Socialist in order to be a real Christian in spirit. (Cries of "No!" and "Yes!")

The question is, shall we evade the issue by leaving it out of the platform, because you do evade it by remaining silent now. By recognizing it and analyzing it you do not evade it. The question is, can you afford to evade it?

DEL. STRICKLAND: The proposition is shall we wipe out Kautsky with Kautsky. The statement made

by the platform committee is a sentence from Kautsky. It is quite in order to wipe it out with another sentence. The sentence just before is this: "The arguments against revolution are derived from the present ruling forms of thought. So long as Christianity ruled the minds of men, the idea of revolution was rejected as sinful revolt against divinely constituted authority."

Now, comrades, you will notice if you consider that passage closely that the word Christianity is not used in any primitive sense, or with any reference to its origin or its revolutionary beginning, but with reference, comrades, to the Christian institutions, organized Christianity.

Now, comrades, listen; you may say that you will avoid this question. You may say you will not take it up. Very well, then, I serve notice on you that whether you do take it up or not, you will have organized religion to meet.

Comrade chairman, I want to refer to a passage on page 110 of Dietzgen's "Philosophical Essays": "We have found that religion and Social Democracy have this in common—I look out, this is not a preacher talking, this is the man whom Marx called the 'Socialist philosopher.' I read it again: 'We have found that religion and Social Democracy have this in common, that they both strive for salvation, yet Social Democracy is in this respect more advanced in that it does not look for salvation in the realm of spirit, but in the world of material realities, taking the human spirit only as its god.'"

If we have a common social origin, if both religion and social democracy have a common social origin, and if economic determinism be true, and if the moral and ethical principles of society be based ultimately upon the manner of economic production, how dare you then say that we have nothing to do with religion.

Please note that if we dodge this issue today, it will come up at another time. Go to the history of the movement in Dubuque and inquire there, as to why there is no local paper there of the Iowa Socialists, and why the movement was cut in two in one year, and they will tell you only by

referring to certain acts of a religious organization. We already have this issue to meet, and I am in favor of the adoption of the committee's report because we ought to dare to make that declaration in the face of an official interpretation of Christianity rather than its original—for remember, comrades, according to Osborne Ward, Christianity carried the red banner of the working class for three hundred years.

I favor the adoption of the committee's report and am opposed to the amendment.

DEL. ELIOT WHITE (Mass.): Your ideal is to be perfectly free from prejudice. As scientific Socialists you are perfectly free from prejudice. I will start by saying that some of you may not know that I am an Episcopal minister in good standing in my church. Let me say next that although you are all free from prejudice you think you know just what I am going to say. Now, if I can show by what I do say that I am saying what you did not expect you will acknowledge, won't you, that you have a little bit of prejudice against me as a minister.

I am in favor of dropping this whole thing out of the program. I don't think you expected me to say that as an Episcopal minister. I think if the Democrats and Republicans can leave that out of their platforms—why, in the name of common sense, do we need it in this program?

I want to object to what has been said on this floor about one of the speakers and the motives that have been imputed to him. I refer to Comrade Lewis. It has been said here that he stated that a good Socialist could not be religious. He said no such thing. I consider that his position was well taken, and his statements well made, and I stand for everything he said.

Now, here is another queer thing about me as a preacher. I have an idea that it might be a good plan to have in this platform the statement that no discrimination should be made by Socialists either for or against people on account of religious or non religious beliefs; and you may think that the reason I say that is because I don't want atheists or infidels, so

called, to keep out Christians. But it is not that. There is more than one place where atheists and infidels are kept out by so-called Christians.

A DELEGATE: Will you offer that as an amendment to the amendment?

DEL. WHITE: I want it let alone. Cut it all out. We have here a movement that we can stand up for, that we can stand in and be of it, and witness for its truth. If people don't like it they will have to dislike it. (Applause.) You should not keep on petting people to become Socialists. You can't do it. If they can't become Socialists because of their manhood and womanhood don't try to pet them into becoming Socialists. They have got to find it out for themselves. I am sorry for some of my old bigoted Christian friends because they have so much to learn, and it is going to be a hard road for them for the next twenty-five years. Christianity is up against the biggest crisis it has ever faced—the Reformation and everything else included—Christianity has its biggest crisis to face, it is in the greatest danger of going to pieces as a moral institution, that it has ever been in. I am perfectly frank to say to you that Christianity as some Christians understand it today is bound to go under, has got to go down. But that is merely White's personal opinion, and the non-Christian may say that is nonsense. That is White's opinion; he holds his opinion and I hold mine. But in the name of common sense let us chisel out any mention whatever of religion from one end to the other; preamble, platform, demand and everything else. In the words of a previous speaker, "Let sleeping dogs lie."

DEL. DEVINE (Ohio): On this question I find myself in a position in which none of the previous speakers has been. Therefore I sought the privilege of getting a chance to speak to you. I find myself in this position. Since I have been in this convention I find myself one of the few who are actively engaged in factories. I also find myself one who must take issue with a sentiment that is gaining in the Socialist movement, and one who must take issue with

something that was said upon this floor last night. I want to say right here that we must be careful upon this question. I stand here today as one actively engaged in the factories, and trying to get my co-workers into the Socialist movement. I find there men of all religions; I find there men of all kinds. I am asked by one class of men: How can I be a Catholic and a Socialist? I am asked that by Catholics. What I and you don't matter. They don't know. You don't know. The question is: Is it anything to either of us what the other is or believes on religion? I am asked by the Catholic how can I be a Socialist and a Catholic? Now, I want to be in a position where I can harmonize those things. Therefore, I want this—I have taken this opportunity of making this point in particular. I recognize that the church has taken an attitude against the Socialist party. I know of a comrade in the factory who was refused absolution because he was a Socialist. It seems to me I am forced to take the position I do today so that I can keep that comrade in the Socialist party, not so much for his vote as for his strength. That is what we are after. So I say that we should put nothing in our platform whatever; I am in favor of striking out entirely any reference to any religious position that the Socialist party takes.

DEL. HUNTER (N. Y.): The reason I wish to have this plank in our platform is because I wish this question settled, so that everybody in the party can have absolute freedom to say what they please on this matter as a question of individual conscience, and say with authority that this political party takes no religious view whatever. You know why the plank was put in the platform of the German party. For years and years the reactionaries of Germany went about trying to divide and keep divided the working class. How? By saying: "That is the party of atheists and agnostics." They are trying that in every part of Europe. They are trying it everywhere. Bebel is an atheist, and he campaigned for atheism, but not as a principle of the political party, but simply as a man, as a known Socialist expressing his own

individual opinion. When the people in Germany came forward and said, "Your party is a party of atheism and agnosticism," the other comrades wanted that statement in there to prove that charge false. In other words they wanted to settle this question once for all; to keep it out of the discussion. When I go—or somebody else goes—I very seldom go to deliver a Christian lecture, and somebody says, "See what Lewis says," or "See what Bebel says." I want something like this proposed statement that is authoritative, not my own individual view, but the formal statement of the position of the party, that we as a party consider this matter to be one of individual conscience. The fact is plain that we are being attacked upon this question. It may or may not have been wise to bring up this matter at all, but if we vote it down, what will be the inevitable result? It will be taken to mean that we do not consider it a matter of individual conscience, and that we desire to adopt views antagonistic to those who hold certain religious views. It will be so considered.

Now I say that we have to face more and more serious fighting upon this question. The debate on this religious question is going to become more and more heated. I believe there is a church in this country which is going more and more to attack Socialism upon this very point. I don't want to have to discuss it. If someone rises and presents the views of Bebel or Lewis or some one else of these views, and they are leading Socialists, and I say, "I don't hold those views," "Well," they say, "these are leaders in your party, and you don't express the view of your party." Then you put out the platform and show the party position in the matter. There is the declaration of principles; not that we believe in any religious view. I want the atheists in this party; I want all the Lewises, all the fellows who are fighting for the cause of the proletariat; we need every man—every man, no matter what his religious views. Let each man hold his own view; let him talk as he likes as an individual; but

don't let him go about and say that this political party is a party of Christians, or a party of atheists, or a party of agnostics; let them all talk Socialism. Let them have their beliefs; let them say that this economic doctrine is in harmony with atheism; if that is their individual belief; let others say that it is in harmony with Christianity if that is their individual belief; let us have absolute freedom, take no position on the matter of religion whatever, and prove to all who would attack us on this ground that it is a matter of individual conscience; that it is a private matter with which the party has nothing to do.

I support the plank as brought in by the committee.

DEL. STIRTON: I have tried for some time to get an opportunity to express the hope that this whole matter would be stricken out. I want to call attention to the fact that no effort has been put forth or is being put forth to place the Socialist party in an attitude of hostility to religion. I do not do that; and we do not want that. All we want is to have this whole matter stricken out. And for this reason, first of all. If this statement is true that religion is no concern of our movement as stated in the amendment or in the original recommendation, that it is a private matter—if that is a true statement, then we don't need it. If it is a lie, then we don't want it. That is what I have striven to get the floor to say that those who take this position are not taking an anti-religious view. I was a Christian once; I am an atheist now; but that is neither here nor there; we are not trying to put a religious or an anti-religious plank in the platform. We simply want it out.

In reply to the position taken by one of the comrades who stated that in the German Declaration of Principles they have this plank, I want to say that there is an essential difference between our situation in Germany and in the United States. In Germany they have a recognized state church, as there is in England and in other countries, and there such a declaration of principles might come in with a certain degree of propriety as showing that they were favoring the

disestablishment of the state church. But here there is no state church.

I am opposed to this proposition because of the implication that would be drawn from it. The comrade said that we did not want it interpreted this way and that way. I am opposed to any declaration in our principles or resolutions or platform which puts us under the necessity of sending an explanatory treatise along with it. I am opposed to it.

There is another thing. I am intensely and bitterly opposed to this statement being accepted as the declaration of the Socialist party for the very reasons which Comrade Hunter set forth as reasons why he supported the resolution; and that is that it is a sop to a certain element; a sort of apologetic utterance for the fact that many of our leaders choose to be atheists. I don't want to take the Socialist platform—I don't intentionally do it—sometimes a word may fall from me in the heat of discussion when I think what I have suffered from the ecclesiastical institution that calls itself Christianity—I don't want to have to make apologies, and say—

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate's time has expired.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Since the question has been opened up, I hope that a large number of the delegates will be privileged to participate in the discussion. I believe we are going to declare rights today. And I hope that the previous question will not be voted so as to prevent any comrade who has any light to throw upon this subject from doing so.

To begin with, I believe it was entirely unnecessary to put this in the platform at all, or any place else since it is sufficiently covered by the constitution. But since the subject has been injected into our proceedings, and in view of the character of the discussion here, and as it will appear in the public press and be quoted from our official records, I am now and for these reasons in favor of the committee's original report.

These scientists who are only utopians I want to call to book. Let us assume that all religions spring originally from the material interests of the people. Still can you say that religions in all their varieties that are ex-

tant in the world today are primarily and now based upon the manner in which the people who believe in them obtain their livelihood?

Cries of "Yes" and "No."

NAT. SEC. BARNES: That is utopianism. Suppose we agree further. So far as we know, fire was first produced by rubbing together pieces of wood. Must we therefore wait today whenever we mention fire that it is connected with rubbing together pieces of wood? The Indians have their heaven, their happy hunting grounds, and they associate their means of livelihood directly with their belief. And looking back through the ages I presume that our original religions were thus brought into existence. Since that time we have developed our industry has become diversified, and our opinions have been distributed over a great realm of purely mental effort or activity, but altogether remotely connected with the manner by which we make our living. Now we are concerned with the conditions of today. And the religions of today are very remotely connected in civilized countries with the ways in which we make our living.

DEL. HERMAN: The question is this: we do not need this kind of plank in our platform. Our constitution states our position relative to religion and relative to race and relative to nationality, and relative to sex. We don't need to have planks in our platform for any kind of religion you may believe in, or stating what kind of religion you shall believe in, or what kind you shall not believe in, or stating that you shall have your own conviction on this question. Surely we have a right to our own opinions on these matters. I have a right to my opinion but I do not ask as an agnostic that we state our position with regard to agnosticism. I do not ask it. I do not ask that we state our position in regard to atheism. I demand that we remain silent on this question. So far as Christianity is concerned—yes, we are opposed to Christianity.

Cries of "No, no."

DEL. HERMAN: Why? Because the church is the organized expression of Christianity.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): I am opposed to both the amendment and the original plank in the program. We are all agreed that vinegar is sour. Why are we not agreed? We are agreed on those things because we know as a matter of fact that sugar is sweet and that vinegar is sour. If science means anything at all, it means that we are convinced that a position to be scientific, it must first be based on fact. Therefore, I say that all these sneers cast at science are superfluous. We should dis-

cuss this question upon its merits. We do not insist that any one should be an agnostic or an atheist before they are allowed to join the Socialist party as some of the comrades have suggested. We do ask that a man or woman shall understand something about the Socialist movement before they be allowed in the Socialist party. Comrade Untermyann said—

DEL. UNTERMANN (Idaho): I rise to a point of order. The point is that I am misquoted; I took exactly the stand the speaker is taking.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

DEL. HERMAN: The question is this: we do not need this kind of plank in our platform. Our constitution states our position relative to religion and relative to race and relative to nationality, and relative to sex. We don't need to have planks in our platform for any kind of religion you may believe in, or stating what kind of religion you shall believe in, or what kind you shall not believe in, or stating that you shall have your own conviction on this question. Surely we have a right to our own opinions on these matters. I have a right to my opinion but I do not ask as an agnostic that we state our position with regard to agnosticism. I do not ask it. I do not ask that we state our position in regard to atheism. I demand that we remain silent on this question. So far as Christianity is concerned—yes, we are opposed to Christianity.

Cries of "No, no."

DEL. HERMAN: Why? Because the church is the organized expression of Christianity.

DELEGATES: That is not true. DEL. HERMAN: Christianity is organized in the church, and that is the only kind that we have the right to recognize. Where does the church stand? Does it stand with the wage-working class. Does it stand with the proletariat or against it? As a church, I mean? Where does John Pierpont Morgan stand when he goes before the country and says that Socialism would destroy religion, that Socialism would destroy the home; I ask you, has he been excommunicated from his church? Is not the Catholic church a Christian institu-

tion? The church is the organized expression of Christianity, and they are opposed to us, the wage-working class; they are lined up with the capitalist class and are fighting with the

Chairman's Bandlow called the convention to order at 7:30 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: The proposition before the house is the amendment to the report of the Platform Committee bearing upon the question of religion being a private matter.

The previous question was ordered.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): Let me make this statement. I have gone into conference between the afternoon session and evening session, with most of the members of the Platform Committee, and I have reached an agreement with them which I am sure the convention would be glad to hear, and it will dispose of this question, I think, amicably to all concerned. (Applause.) I would like to have the floor on that for about two minutes. I think the members of the Platform Committee will agree.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections.

DEL. LEWIS: Comrade Chairman and Comrades: I will preface my remarks by saying that I consider myself and every other delegate on this floor as being present at this convention for the sole purpose of promoting the best interests of the Socialist party. (Applause.) I am willing to waive any personal views of mine, and I believe the members of the Platform Committee are in the same position, to promote those interests. Since this convention adjourned, I have been able to get into conference with Victor Berger, with Morris Hillquit, with Comrade Work and as many other members of the Platform Committee as possible. I agree with the sentiment expressed by the National Secretary that while it might have been better to have left this question out in the beginning, now that it has been introduced, to withdraw this question altogether would put us in a false position, or at least render us open to false representation by the capitalist press. (Ap-

capitalist class, helping them to keep in slavery the proletariat of the United States and of the world.

On motion the convention adjourned until 7:30 p.m.

## AN EVENING SESSION.

plause.) And so, while it may not harmonize with my personal opinions to have this plank remain in the platform, I am willing to sink those personal opinions rather than put the Socialist movement of America in a false position and lay it open to the attacks of our enemies, who are always seeking some opportunity for misrepresentation. (Applause.) The only thing I was afraid of in this No. 6 as it appeared in the program was this: That such a declaration might be interpreted as limiting free speech on the Socialist platform, and that it could be misused to say that a Socialist speaker on the Socialist platform shall not be allowed to expound the materialistic conception of history as it is expounded in the classic literature of the Socialist philosophy, and I maintain that anything that is good enough for our standard books ought to be good enough for our platform, and I wish to keep free speech open on that platform. I find that there is a unanimous agreement with that position among the Socialists who have been elected by this convention to the Platform Committee, and so if the Platform Committee will give me an assurance that will go into the stenographic report of this convention that it is not the intention that this plank shall be used to limit free speech on the Socialist platform, so that it will leave it possible for Comrade Carr, or Comrade Bental, or any of the Comrades in that group to argue Socialism from the point of view of Christianity, I am perfectly willing they should do that, if I may argue Socialism from the point of view of materialism and some other man may argue Socialism from the point of view of atheism or agnosticism, or whatever may happen to be his point of view; that this argument in favor of Socialism shall be from the individual point of view or any man on the Socialist platform, irrespective of what his religious or anti-religious opinions may be, so long as his argu-

ment conforms with the classic position of Socialist philosophy. If that will be preserved with this plank in the platform, then I am willing that the plank shall remain, and I am willing to vote for it and ask those comrades who loyally supported my position this afternoon to go with me in support of that plank in that platform. (Applause.)

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL (Ill.): A point of information. I want a point of information from Lewis. I want to find out who has given him the right to put himself above the party. He has no right to agree for us. We can adopt anything we darn please. Whatever the delegates accept, we accept. We don't have to have any assurance from him.

(Much confusion on the convention floor.)

DEL. LEWIS: I speak only for myself.

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL: Whatever the delegation accepts is adopted. You don't have to give it any assurance.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate will be in order.

DEL. LEWIS: I am pledging only my own vote. I am not pledging the vote of any other delegate to this convention.

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL: You can vote against it.

DEL. LEWIS: I am requesting those who agree with me on this position to vote with me in this matter, because I believe that to so vote is to the best interests of the Socialist party of America. After all, you will do as you please.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Slayton has the floor. For or against, Comrade Slayton?

DEL. SLAYTON: I am against the plank as it stands in the committee's report, and I am going to briefly tell you why.

Someone said, on the floor, that these beliefs that we may hold concerning the supernatural origin of things have nothing to do with the struggle of the workingman for a living. I emphatically deny it. If I had a congregation, and could make them believe that they who were producing the wealth of the world were in the situation of life that the Al-

mighty Creator intended that they should be, do you suppose for a moment they would get up and resist the conditions they found themselves in? No, wouldn't they be perfectly satisfied, and couldn't my exploitation go on, and could I not lead them, even with their consent, if they believed they were occupying the position that they were destined to fill? It stifles revolt. A man ceases to be a rebel and becomes like a young robin, willing to accept anything the old bird brings, whether worms or shingle nails.

I shall try to illustrate by drawing the parallel of the Indian and the buffalo, and by a materialistic interpretation show you the application of that parallel to the workingman. The Indian, when the buffalo was plentiful, imagined that the Great Spirit put the buffalo there for his sole use. When the grass got short and the buffalo migrated, so did the Indian, and the Indian imagined that the Great Spirit was displeased. He couldn't see that there was any material reason for it. Of course, the buffalo left because the grass got short, and the Indian left because the buffalo left, and because he was dependent upon the buffalo for his food—a material proposition in both cases.

When the workingman gets out of a job, he goes and hunts another, as the Indian hunted the buffalo, and when the workingman finds a job, he thanks God that he has found a job just as the Indian thanked the Great Spirit that he found the buffalo. Just exactly the same principle applies to both the parallel is absolutely perfect.

DEL. SPARGO: Mr. Chairman, I feel called upon to raise a point in order that the delegate is not discussing the propriety or impropriety of including that statement in our platform, but he is discussing the philosophical questions involved.

DEL. SLAYTON: I can show their relation, if you will permit me.

DEL. SPARGO: I raise the point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman must rule that it is impossible for him to put into the mouths of delegates words that refer to the questions at issue. If a delegate does not make

the best use of his time, that is against him. (Applause.)

DEL. SLAYTON: Right you are, but I am going to make use of it before I get through. If Comrade Spargo will listen he will see that the application to the Indian and the buffalo is perfect. If these things are true, if they act socially as well as individually, and if they act for the whole tribe of Indians as well as one, and if they be a fact, then every relation or every effect or every relation is the reflex of economic conditions. It is the social reflex and has its effect on society as any other effect acts upon society. (Applause.)

That being the case, religion becomes a social affair and not an individual affair. As for the program just laid down, that is the point that I want to make; when the tribe left, what was the social, and it looked to the Great Spirit for interpretation. That is the point in issue. If you do not want to lay it on the party, then leave out the plank, and then it is an individual affair as to whether he shall or shall not interpret it or try to interpret it as he pleases. But if you put it in there, you recognize the religious question and allow the other fellow an opportunity to force you on the defensive, by the very recognition of it. Leave out the plank and you can show the platform and say that we are not taking part in that matter, except as the other fellow raises it; but if you talk pure economics, nine times out of ten he does not raise it at all. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade Chairman and Comrades: As a member of the Platform Committee, I am one of the sinners responsible for this discussion; in fact, I am THE sinner. I am the man who suggested it. Like George Washington, I can say that I have done it with my little hatchet, so to speak. (Laughter.) And I am willing to own up.

It is not a question as to whether religion is right or wrong. We are not to discuss that question here. However, it is a condition that we are up against, and not a theory.

In the first place, a plank of this kind you will find in every platform or program of every other civilized nation in the world. Yet in no country

do they have as much reason for it as in this country. There is not a race in the world that is as thoroughly religious as the Anglo-Saxon race. If you want a party made up of free-thinkers only, then I can tell you right now how many you are going to have. If you want to wait, with our co-operative commonwealth, until you have made a majority of the people into free-thinkers, I am afraid we will have to wait a long while. (Applause.) I say this, although I am known, not only in Milwaukee, but wherever our papers are read—as a pronounced agnostic.

However, comrades, this is not a question as to whether every other comrade agrees with me in my views on religion. It is a question as to whether he agrees with my views on the economic question. That is all I am asking for. (Applause.) I want to ask my fellow workman whether he is an agnostic or a Roman Catholic, or a Protestant, or a Presbyterian, or a Jew; I am simply to ask him whether he is a Socialist. (Applause.) That is the only position we can take.

Now, the church is with the capitalist class, without doubt, especially the church per se, the Roman Catholic Church. That church has always sided with the class in power. That church was with feudalism as long as feudalism was in power. On the other hand, as you well know, all the great philosophers of the Eighteenth century—Rousseau and Voltaire, and the others—the men who opposed feudalism—were pronounced atheists. The church was on the side of feudalism, while feudalism was on top, and the church now sides with capitalism, because capitalism is on top. The opponents of the ruling system must naturally expect the opposition of the church. And the church butts up against the same thing that it did a hundred years ago. In my home town, in Milwaukee, since we had an open discussion in the newspapers with Archbishop Messmer—now at the head of the Roman Catholic societies of the United States—from that time on, there has been a constant agitation against all Socialists and Atheists. You can hardly find a paper in which we are not denounced as men who want to abolish all religion and



abolish God. Something must be done to enable us to show that Socialism, being an economic theory—or rather the name for an epoch of civilization—has nothing to do with religion either way, neither pro nor con.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N.Y.): Comrade Chairman and Comrades: Nobody regrets more than I do that this question has arisen in this convention, but as long as it occupies the position that it does, I believe that if there is to be any expression upon it, that expression should be the truth and not a lie. (Applause.) I am opposed to the adoption of the committee's recommendation and I favor the amendment on the ground that, as long as we are too cowardly to express what we believe, we should be silent entirely. (Applause.)

Is there a man who will dare to say that religion is not a social question; that it is the question of the individual; that the Socialist movement is not involved in it? When we talk of being scientists and of science, and when we know that science and religion do not mix, are we a body of men who recognize the need of studying and legislating for the social, political and economic welfare of the ignorant, down-trodden of the lower strata of society; or, instead of that, are we an organization of vote-getters who would straddle everything? (Applause.)

We must talk in tones that cannot be misunderstood when we talk at all, or we must remain silent. I am in favor, at any and all times, of speaking what I think and endeavoring as nearly as possible to think what is right and truthful. (Applause.) When we turn to religion and religious institutions, we can look back into the Dark Ages and see our ancestors, our antediluvian ancestors, in their caves and holes, looking to the supernatural and the superstitious. But when we talk of educating mankind and when we talk of raising mankind above the level in which he is, then we have got to throw from his arms those crutches that bind him to his slavery, and religion is one of them. Let it be understood that the moment the Socialist party's whole aim and object is to get votes, we can get them more quickly

by trying to please the religionists and those whose only ambition is to pray to God and crush mankind. (Applause.)

I have listened with patience during the many debates that have taken place in this convention. I have listened with patience and indulgence to the many straddles of important issues that are vital to the cause of Socialism and the progress of the human family. I have seen those straddles, and I have seen things that have seemed to me entirely unnatural in a Socialist convention, but I have remained silent. But I can no longer still my voice and allow it to go on. Let us say nothing or say the truth. To spread forth to the world that religion is the individual's affair and that religion has no part in the subjection of the human race, we lie when we say it. (Great applause.) The Socialist party has reached a stage where it has come to the turnpike, and will either have to stand for the truth or declare for opportunism of the barest kind and invite anybody and everybody to give us their vote, irrespective of the importance of the views that they hold on economic slavery.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): I rise to a question of personal privilege. My position was this: That, not being at the meeting of the committee when they framed the immediate demands, I had nothing whatever to do with the insertion of that plank or any other of the reform planks in that platform. I informed the committee, when I left, that I would not touch any reform that would go into that platform, that I was opposed to the idea of religion, but on the other hand I advocated a statement, in the declaration of principles, that the church was on the side of the capitalist class.

DEL. SOLOMON: I rise to a point of order. If Comrade Clark disagreed with the Committee, it was his business to bring in a minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair holds with the point of order.

DEL. SIMONS: We cannot, we dare not, and we do not want to touch any question as vital as this question that is before us tonight. We are not going to be allowed to touch it. Already the battle is being fought within

and without our organization upon this question. Comrade Berger held a paper in his hand which he intended to read, containing a speech of David Rose, delivered on the 4th of this month, not in campaign time, and filled almost from beginning to end with bitter denunciation of the Socialist party on the ground that it was a party of atheism, a party of agnosticism, a party simply of anti-clericalism and against the church. That simply showed that today the capitalist class is using the institutions of religion as it is using the institutions of government, for the purpose of class rule. And even the institutions of religion have turned themselves over to a man that is the creature of the disreputable resorts of Milwaukee, in order to be used to beat down the workers in their election struggles. So I say to you that we cannot touch this question. At the same time, let us remember that because capitalism uses the institution of religion just as it uses the institution of the state, we have no more right to declare that there shall be no religion and that a man shall not have a right to stand where he pleases on religion, than we have to declare that we propose that there shall be no state, that we shall destroy the state or not use the state at this time. Do not misunderstand me in using that analogy. We do not ask to reach out and take the state for our purposes, for we could not use it. But we say that while religion exists, and it may exist forever—for let me tell you, there was a time when I was just as sure on all the principles of Socialism, on all the principles of religion and on all the principles of atheism. I have changed from one to another sometimes in my life, but I am not quite so sure now of all those things as I used to be. I am now truly an agnostic in science, in religion and in Socialism. (Applause.) I do not know it all, but I want to know it all, and I believe that every comrade with me has a right to want to know and to work out his own investigation.

And so a religion which has survived savagery and barbarism and feudalism and well through capitalism, is not going to die tomorrow because

here and there we spell God with a little "g" and sometimes hurl our darts at it; don't forget that. (Applause.) And while that exists we have that right. I won't say that Comrade White, for instance, is not just as sincere, hasn't got just as good a brain as I have and isn't just as sincere in his belief that within his system of thought he can reconcile the materialistic principles of Socialism, the demand for the class struggle, with his religious notions, as I am that he cannot. If Lord Kelvin could reconcile his scientific knowledge—and he stood at the head of the scientific men of the world—if he could reconcile his scientific knowledge with religion, it is not for me to rise to such a tremendous height as to say that he was a fakir, or deceived. (Applause.) So I ask you to take this plank announcing that we hold religion to be a private matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now is on the amendment.

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I want to ask a question. Is the Mayor of Milwaukee of more importance than the President of the United States, that he must be answered through the plank and the other through a special letter?

DEL. LEWIS: Three members of the Platform Committee, before this session, promised to give me the pledge that I asked for in this speech. Two of them have used up their time without having done so. Now, I ask for this information.

DEL. SPARGO: I raise a point of order, that no three members of this convention can give any pledge that will bind the Socialist party. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the acceptance of the substitute offered by Delegate Hilquit.

(The question was put, but the result being in doubt, a show of hands was called for, and the vote resulted in 79 for the substitute and 78 against, and the substitute was declared carried.)

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N.Y.): I rise to make a demand for a roll-call upon that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will not entertain a motion of that character.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: I appeal from the decision of the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The result of the vote had been announced.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: I raise a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: That the chair has no right to render that decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is in accordance with the rule provided.

A DELEGATE: Move to reconsider.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: I withdraw the appeal and make a motion to reconsider.

Delegate Brower also moved to reconsider.

Seconded.

Delegate Spargo moved to table the motion to reconsider.

Seconded and carried.

Delegate John M. Work, of Iowa, filed the following explanation of his vote on the question of religion: I was in favor of the spirit of the substitute, but I voted against it because I wanted an opportunity to vote in favor of the original report of the committee. Doubtless others were in the same position. That probably accounts for the closeness of the vote on the substitute. As my name was brought into the discussion by Comrade Lewis, and I tried in vain to get the floor, I wish to say that while I certainly do grant every comrade freedom of speech on this subject, both inside and outside the movement, I nevertheless very seriously question the wisdom of those anti-religious comrades who insist upon dragging their irreligion into their Socialist speeches and writings. They have done the Socialist cause an immense amount of harm. I utterly repudiate the assertion that in adopting that plank we adopted a lie.

On the contrary, we adopted the literal and unqualified truth. Socialism is not concerned with matters of religious belief. If Socialism causes any changes in religious opinions, it will be merely because of the fact that Socialism will elevate the human race to a higher plane of existence where it can discover and grasp new truths. And, in that day, the opinions now

held by agnostics, atheists and materialist monists are just as likely to be overturned as are those of any religiousist. The idea that Socialist principles lead to agnosticism, atheism, or materialist monism, is false.

#### PROGRAM CONTINUED.

DEL. SIMONS (for Committee on Platform): We now proceed to the industrial demands:

"7. The improvement of the industrial conditions of the workers:

"(a.) By shortening the work day in keeping with the increased productivity of machinery."

Adopted without objection.

"(b.) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week."

Adopted without objection.

"(c.) By securing a more vigorous inspection of workshops and factories."

Adopted without objection.

"(d.) By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age."

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): The laws in most of our capitalist states do have a declaration for sixteen years of age, and I don't think that such a resolution has a place in a Socialist convention. I move to amend by making it eighteen years of age. (Seconded.)

DEL. SIMONS: The committee wishes just a moment. I appreciate your desire to get through. The committee took a day to consider that. The comrade is very much mistaken in his statement. I might say there are, I think, but two states in which that is true, instead of nearly all of them.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I do not think the objection of the comrade applies very strongly. There are similar objections to all the other planks. I think we better adopt all of these, and at the end there probably make a statement that will fix the thing all right, and not make the Socialist party ridiculous by having something the same as in the platforms of other parties. I favor adopting that clause along with the rest.

DEL. MARGUERITE PREVREY (Ohio): I want to speak in opposition to the amendment offered that

the age be made eighteen. We as Socialists fully realize that you cannot legislate the child labor problem out of existence. We fully realize that as long as we have the capitalist system where the father of a family does not get wages sufficient to support the whole family, the children must go into the shops and factories to earn a living, and that they can be kept at school until sixteen. We are doing very well, as the legislation against child labor at the present time is not effective because the parents of the children must decide whether the child shall go without the necessities of life, or go into the factory, and the mother has to decide to let the child go into the factory in order that the child may have the necessities of life. That is a condition that you cannot legislate out of existence until the head of the family gets the full product of his labor. I am opposed to the amendment for that reason. Don't let us make ourselves ridiculous. We should understand the child labor problem better than to apply such an amendment to this proposition.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): I am opposed to that clause for the immediate demands. If that clause would say that we oppose child labor and make a provision then so that the state should clothe and care for the child, then I would be in favor of that clause. But to make no provision for it, seems really worse to me than the mercy of the capitalist class in employing them so that they may get food and raiment. If they will have it that the state shall make provision to take care of the child and feed, clothe and educate it, then I am for the resolution; otherwise, I am against it.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): Mr. Chairman and Comrades: On this question of child labor: I am no theorist. I have had the practical experience, and if I make any mistakes in the statement that I am about to make, I call on the delegates from the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania to contradict me. Comrade Frevey here spoke and said that the poverty of the father and mother compelled the child to go to work. I know the poverty is there. I was

born and raised in poverty. In fact, I have never been able to get out of that poverty. But the point I want to make is this: Before I was nine years of age I became a wage-worker, and I have not been able to get out of that class since. I have tried many expedients, and finally I have been driven into the Socialist party, to get not only myself out of that class, but to get men and women and children of the future age out of it. The same argument that Comrade Frevey advanced against making the age limit eighteen years was used against making it ten years, twenty-five years ago. (Applause.) The same argument was advanced against making it twelve years of age in the state of Pennsylvania twenty years ago. The same argument was advanced a few years ago when it was made sixteen years. Now, I realize that it is very little when we just raise that limit two years, but I want to point out to you that a child sixteen years of age is not yet matured, and that the young body with its unformed bones is not able to be in this struggle for existence and mature properly so as to become one of the future citizens of the United States. The child is not responsible for the poverty of the father and mother through which the child was driven into slavery too young. (Applause.) I agree with another comrade here who made a remark that this is no place for the declaration. Instead of putting in an age limit of this kind at which the children shall go to work in the capitalist society, let us put all our energies into getting Socialism, and never mind any of those immediate demands. And then your program about which we have been quarreling all afternoon and evening is nothing but a farce (applause), for every declaration you have made, the enemy are going to make one of their own, and just as radical, and they will make much more capital out of it.

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): I really did not know there were so many impossibilities in this convention. (A voice, "One more.") You just found it out. If we are going to wait until we get Socialism, and if we are going to leave the child in the factory until

we get Socialism, then I am not a Socialist. (Applause.) You may talk of it as you please, I am not willing to do so. I am not willing to leave the children to starve in the factory, to let them work their bodies to mere skeletons until we have established the co-operative commonwealth. This is all very well in theory, but it does not work in practice. I will ask the child in the factory, whether he is willing to wait until you get the co-operative commonwealth and see the answer he is going to give you. (Applause.) The child in the factory will be more grateful to the cheap reformer who is going to get him out of that factory hell than to the impossibilist Socialist who is going to make conditions all right after a while, when the child is completely ruined, and comes to the co-operative commonwealth when he is about ready to die of consumption. This is the kind of policy a working class party stands for, is it? I am ashamed for comrades that will applaud such sentiments. There is not a Socialist party in Europe or anywhere in the world which stands for any such impossibilist tactics, and I hope you will not stand for it. (Applause.)

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): Comrade Chairman: I come from the State of Pennsylvania, and I want to call your attention to impossibilism. Four years ago, at the behest of the trade unionists, we got a law adopted in the State of Pennsylvania prohibiting the employment of children under eighteen years of age in the bituminous coal mines. It was scarcely on the statute books before the district of Pittsburgh of the United Mine Workers of America passed a resolution denouncing the law. I have here to back up what I say a member of the United Mine Workers of the State of Pennsylvania, coming from that district. Now, if you want impossibilism, go ahead. You who come from Wisconsin and talk practical Socialism should take notice.

DEL. KORNGOLD: That is not the question.

DEL. MOORE: I don't care, I am addressing my remarks to all you impossibilists who label yourselves practical Socialists. (Applause.) I am telling you the fact that none of

your theoretical ideas, none of the assertions as to Kautsky, Bebel and Marx can get around. I am giving you a fact. I will tell you, I believe that Comrade Clark in this delegation knows that when we some twenty years ago got a law prohibiting the employment of children fourteen years of age in the State of Pennsylvania we were driven out of the coal regions, and the very same argument was used then that is used now. Now, if you want to go on as the comrade over there told you, go on putting practical planks in your platform, but there is not a politician, no matter who he is, a Hearst, a Bryan or a Roosevelt, that can't beat you out. Go ahead and do it. Let me call your attention to another one of the practical Socialists. Theodore Roosevelt, they say, put into the laws of the United States a child labor law for the District of Columbia, that excepts out of its provisions every child that is employed in the District of Columbia, but is a model in all other respects so far as the mills and mines—that don't exist in that district—are concerned. Now, if you want to go on with your impossibilism, go on.

Del. Konikow moved the previous question, and it was carried.

DEL. WOODEY (Cal.): Now, what I say I am going to say very calmly and dispassionately. There is a question before us as to whether this convention should adopt any immediate demands. I believe that we should, and I believe it for this reason: In my judgment, the time is coming when the Socialist party will go into power in some large city and in some of the states of the union, and they will do that long before they get in power in the nation. Let us suppose that in the last election in the city of Chicago the Socialists had carried the city and got the entire administration. Now, I am going to ask you whether the Socialist party in the city of Chicago would have felt itself under obligations to do anything to relieve the workers in the city of Chicago. If they did, it would have to be done on the plan of immediate demands. (Applause.) Let us suppose the Socialist party got control of the State of Illinois, and they may do that in many of the states of the

union long before they get control in the United States. It is true in Germany; it is true in some of the European countries where they have had control in some parts of the country for years. Now, then, suppose they get control, will they attempt to use the state machinery so far as capitalism will allow them to use it for the benefit of the workers? Would the workers in the city of Chicago, in power in the city of Chicago, attempt to operate any of the municipal franchises? Would they? Or would they say with you gentlemen who are waiting for the setting up of the co-operative commonwealth, "No, we will not do a single thing. We will run the city of Chicago just as it is now being run until we can reach out and get it all." I tell you that I believe this is the line that we will have to take upon this question of government ownership. No Hearst party, Republican party, or any other party is going to declare in favor of government ownership without paying for the franchises. I am for the Socialist party declaring in favor, as fast as they can get in possession in any locality, of taking everything without a cent of compensation, and forcing the issue as to whether there is to be compensation or not. (Applause.) I take the ground that you have already paid for these franchises—already paid more than they are worth, and we are simply proposing to take possession of what we have already paid for. Well, you say the covets will defeat us. All right, let them defeat us if they will. We will throw the responsibility for the defeat on the capitalist parties that defeat the thing. Another thing; I don't know a great deal about what is being done over in Wisconsin, but my notion of it is that in Wisconsin they are doing things, understand. I believe in insisting on taking everything in sight, understand, as fast as we can get it. Another thing: I don't know a European nation, including Germany, France, England, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and all the rest of the countries, but what has a municipal program. They go farther than that; they even start co-operative institutions under the direction of the Socialist party. Listen, we can't af-

ford to wait for the alleviation of the suffering of the people. We must do it as fast as we can get in charge.

DEL. GOAZIOU (Pa.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I am against this proposition, the same as I am against every other proposition in the immediate demands. (Applause.) Not because I am against preventing children going into the factories, but I am against trying to get votes on immediate demands. I am in favor of trying to get all the votes we possibly can on Socialism, and not on immediate demands. (Applause.) I know we have in this country a growing movement among Socialists who are wanting votes no matter how they will get them. They are willing to put in appeals to the farmers, appeals to the middle class, and appeals to everybody, so that they can get votes. They will get votes sometimes, but whatever they get of non-Socialist votes on this and other demands of the same kind, the result will be that they have in France at the present time, of Millerandism and a whole lot of the same evils, and anarchy following this, a growing anarchistic movement as the result of immediate demands. As Comrade Moore has told you, the State of Pennsylvania we have people outside of the Socialist movement who are willing to do all that is possible to be done to shorten the hours of labor. It is not necessary for the Socialist movement to spend its time passing resolutions in favor of sixteen, eighteen, or twenty hours. These are reform movements that other people will be well able to attend to without the Socialists spending their time about it. Some of the comrades here speak as though they were going to be in power tomorrow and be able to give us all we desire in the way of immediate demands. I hold that whenever the Socialist party gets so strong in power that it will be able to do something that will be of permanent benefit to the working class, we will be able to get Socialism and not immediate demands. (Applause.) And so long as we are not sufficiently strong and sufficiently in power to get Socialism, then the capitalist class will be in control and will allow only what

they wish to allow so as to prolong the present system.

DEL. MORRISON (Ariz.): I have not asked for one word in this convention until now, and you know we lawyers don't say much, anyhow. (Laughter.) I am opposed both to the original and to the amendment, sorry as I am to say it. As highly as I esteem my comrade, whom I love as a brother, Comrade Cannon, I am not in accord with him in his amendments, and of the two I would rather have the original, and I will tell you the reason why. My comrade told us about his early days and about how he worked. Well, I think I can tell you something, too, comrades, of early struggles. Left alone in the world when I was nine years of age in the frozen regions of Minnesota, I wished to know something about the world and went to work in the iron mines at eleven years of age. I think I know something of what it is to bow my neck to the taskmaster. And I will say, comrades, if I hadn't had a chance to work until I was eighteen I would not have been here to bother you with my voice, and I would have starved to death. Unless there should be some provision in that, that we are going to have the power to feed these poor devils that can't work, we had better shoot them. Then again, there ought to be there a provision that no man shall ever get married till he is eighteen. I know a great many that got married before. Or, that no girl should get married. I think it is a preposterous thing unless we have some provision for support. Of course I expect to see Socialism ushered in tomorrow, and I know, since I have had a chance to have my say before this convention, it will be sure to come in. But now, we ought to look fairly at this. We have most of us graduated from the low primary class, and I object as a Socialist and a Socialist worker, one who is willing to give his life and everything to the cause—I object to going back into the primary class. You have graduated, and I say, let us leave such things out. Let Willie Hearst and Bryan put them into their platforms if they wish, but for God's sake don't force me to go back.

DEL. MILLER (Cal.): Comrades, Chairman and comrades, there are some of our friends who are very much opposed to the sweet bye and bye people among the Christians. There are others

among the Socialists who certainly belong to the sweet bye and bye because they don't propose to do anything now. (Applause.) You and I who believe in doing things, who believe in telling the attitude of the Socialist Party toward the working class as you go down the highways and stand on the street corners of this country, we have something more than word of mouth as a justification for what we have to say. We want to be able to put our hands upon the official declaration of the party and say, "This is the attitude of the Socialist Party upon this question."

Some of the comrades tell us that we can do nothing until we have captured all the machinery of government. The men who have kept their eyes on our comrades abroad know that is not true. They know that since the English workmen have turned their attention to politics and put their men into parliament, instead of sending polite petitions up there, that the Taff-Vale decision has been reversed. And the comrades who have been taking part in the working class politics of Europe know that there are not more than one-third as many men injured in the coal mines of England that there is in Pennsylvania. They know that there are not more than one-sixth the accidents upon the roads controlled by the state that there are in our own country controlled by private corporations. What is the use of getting so far away from the truth? It is time that you scientific fellows should pay some regard to the actual facts in industrial life.

My friends, child labor is a curse in this country, and everybody knows it. Why should not the Socialists declare their position upon that question? Don't you realize perfectly well that with the working class in power we should not have the courts continually sending out their injunctions? I don't you realize that a million Socialist votes this fall will make many laws constitutional that have been held to be unconstitutional before? Don't we know that the capitalists as we march steadily on are going to grant more and more of the demands of the Socialist Party? Let us agree definitely what we want, for remember what we want now are seen going to take.

The laboring people of this country have just about reached the position where they are going to stop making

dividends for the capitalists and are going to make history for humanity.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is upon the adoption of the amendment to the motion. All in favor of substituting the word "eighteen" for the word "sixteen," will say Aye. Those opposed, No. The Noes seem to have it. The Noes have it. All in favor of adopting the report of the committee as read will signify it by saying Aye. Those opposed, No. The Ayes seem to have it. The Ayes have it; and it is so ordered. Proceed Comrade Chairman.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"(e) By forbidding interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict-labor and of all unsuspected factories."

THE CHAIRMAN: There being no objection that section is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"(f) By abolishing official charity, and substituting in its place compulsory insurance against unemployment, illness, accidents, invalidism, old age and death."

DEL. COLE (Cal.): I move a substitute. Although my seem a small matter I do it for this reason: our platform is supposed to be a sort of lesson for trades unionists who are looking for hints. This matter of insurance brought up in this clause is about the same as the Bismarck State Socialistic idea, which tends to draw on the small salaried woman, and make her pay out his small salary in insurance for himself; and thus take it out of the little workman. It does not in any way help him to get a bigger salary, nor does it take anything from those who are exploiting him. My substitute is along the line of the Socialist philosophy. It is this:

"By pensions for the old and infirm, the funds for such pensions to be raised by general taxation."

You understand, of course—I admit I do not always make myself very clear; but the idea is that these pensions shall be paid out of the national treasury in the same manner as the pensions for the widows of soldiers are paid. You do not tax the soldier as according to this proposed clause you would tax the worker. You compel him to pay out of his salary the pensions you propose; but you do not tax the soldier. My substitute provides that those pensions shall be paid out of general taxation of all

the people who have property, thereby taxing a little from those who have been doing the exploiting. Although we may not get the power at once to put this in force the working class may take a lesson and may put it in force finally by their demands.

The motion was duly seconded, put and lost. The original section was adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"8. The extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the amount of the bequests and to the nearness of kin."

A DELEGATE: Will the chairman of the committee explain to us what that means?

DEL. SIMONS: That has been in since 1888.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Time it was going out.

DEL. SIMONS: It means that the tax would increase by gradations; say nothing up to one thousand dollars; five per cent on \$10,000; 25 per cent on \$100,000; 50 per cent on a million; and so on, until we have the whole of it above a certain sum.

THE CHAIRMAN: There being no objection the section is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS: The next section is Section 9. (Reading):

"9. A graduated income tax." THE CHAIRMAN: No objection? It is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"10. Unrestricted and equal suffrage for women; and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction."

DEL. WINNIE BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I just want to call attention to one part of it—

DEL. SIMONS: You want to call their attention to this pledge to take up active work?

DEL. BRANSTETTER: Yes.

DEL. SIMONS: It is recommended by the Women's Committee, and recommended by the Platform Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to this section as read?

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): There is an omission here. A slight grammatical or rhetorical omission. It should read "for men and women." I don't believe that as it stands now. "Equal suffrage for women," it makes any sense.

DEL. SIMONS: That is right. It is in the original draft.

THE CHAIRMAN: There being no objection it is so ordered.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"11. The initiative and referendum, proportional representation, and the right of recall."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection? Adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"12. The abolition of the Senate."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection? Adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"13. The abolition of the veto power of the President."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection? Adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"14. That the National Constitution be made amendable by majority vote."

THE CHAIRMAN: I hear no objection. It is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"15. Government by majority. In all elections where no candidate receives a majority the result to be determined by a second ballot."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection?

DEL. GOAZIOU (Pa.): I am opposed to the adoption of that last clause. If I understand it right, it is the second ballot, as they have it in France.

DEL. SIMONS: Yes.

DEL. GOAZIOU: It seems to me if you want to open the door to all kinds of fusion and confusion that is all that we need here. It has been the cause of the greatest trouble in France—more than anything else. While the Socialist Parties of France have a straight ticket on the first ballot, if they don't elect on the first vote they have been continually fusing with whatever party was next to the Socialist Party, and trying to help this friend and that friend, and that is just what Gompers says: Help our friends and fight our enemies. There can be no doubt that it has caused more dissatisfaction in the Socialist Party of France than anything else, due to the effect of this second vote, that is the fusing with the radical parties after the first vote had failed to elect. I hope you will not adopt that section and say that we are in favor of that sort of thing in this country. We shall have lots of chance of

fusion without getting a second ballot. I move to strike out that clause.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): This is the first time I have taken the time of the convention. I do not desire to delay you more than a moment. I believe the matter of such great importance to the movement should not be decided here tonight. This is a matter for the entire organization to carefully consider throughout the country, and therefore I am in favor of striking this out, and sending this matter to the various locals for them to give it serious consideration; and after arguing it from all sides they can come back here four years from now to decide whether or not we desire to adopt this measure. I believe if that course is followed we shall have a better understanding of the question and shall be able to vote more intelligently upon it. I am therefore in favor of striking out this clause.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the section just read be stricken out. All in favor will say Aye? Those opposed, No. The Ayes have it; it is so ordered.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"15. The enactment of further measures for the general education, and for the conservation of health. The elevation of the present bureau of education into a department, and the creation of a department of public health. Is it clear what that means? Cries of "No" and "Yes."

DEL. SIMONS: We have a department that takes mighty good care of hogs. But we have no department to take care of human beings. This is an attempt to make the government take at least as much interest in men and women and children as it does in hogs. The other proposition is to extend the bureau of education into a department which will be ready—perhaps this will suit our friends who want Utopia—which will be ready for the co-operative commonwealth when it comes.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"16. The separation of the present bureau of labor from the department of commerce and labor and its elevation to the rank of a department."

THE CHAIRMAN: No objection? It is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"17. The free administration of justice."

That is a demand for an abolition of the fee system.

THE CHAIRMAN: No objection? It is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS: That concludes the report with the exception of a single sentence from the other platform.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Did you read the clause on the unemployed?

DEL. SIMONS: It was adopted. This is the clause I wish to read:

"Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation for the workers to seize the whole powers of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry and thereby come into their rightful inheritance.

There being no objection, the clause was considered carried.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I think the chairman has failed to report an immediate demand dealing with the unemployed problem.

DEL. SIMONS: That we agreed to put—

DEL. HILLQUIT: That is the one I was asking you about.

A DELEGATE: A point of information. Wasn't there a clause about the election of judges?

DEL. SIMONS: I thought I read that. (Reading)

"That all judges be elected by the people for short terms, and that the power to issue injunctions should be curbed by immediate legislation."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.): We have before us now the proposition of the unemployed, and the proposition last read that all judges be elected for short terms, and the power to issue injunctions be curbed by immediate legislation. I wish to move that we amend that clause by making it read "that the power to issue injunctions shall be taken from them." I mean the power to issue injunctions in its entirety.

The motion was duly seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded that the section be amended by making it read, "that the power to issue injunctions shall be taken from them." All in favor say Aye. Opposed, No. The Noes have it. The motion is de-

feated. If there is no objection the section is adopted as read. The next business is the section in regard to the unemployed.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"We pledge ourselves to the following program: We demand immediate government relief for the unemployed workers by building roads and canals, by reforesting of the forest lands, by reclamation of arid lands, and by extending other useful public works; that all workers employed on such works shall be employed directly by the government under an eight hour working day and at the prevailing union wages. The government shall also loan money to the states and municipalities without interest for the carrying on of public works, and it shall contribute to the funds of labor organizations for the purpose of assisting their unemployed members, and shall take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist system."

I wish to speak to that proposition. I move its adoption.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I have a substitute, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Suppose you let Comrade Simons speak and then present your substitute.

DEL. FIELDMAN: This has been thrashed out all day.

THE CHAIRMAN: You might agree with Simons after he gets through.

A DELEGATE: He might agree with the substitute.

DEL. SIMONS: I wish to make an explanation. I have kept out of several of these debates. I have let things go that I was opposed to. I just want to make it clear to you that this is a comprehensive plan. It does not go into details; but leaves those to be worked out by those who may be in power. We are not going to be in power; and the only way in which we can force action on such a matter is by piling up such a vote that they will give it to us in fear that we may take more. We have enumerated a few things that could be done; but we have not attempted to say how they shall raise the money; we have not attempted to go into small details, as to financial administration, or

any of those things which belong to the capitalist class to decide. We have put in this clause the idea of contributing to the unemployed fund of the unions, which is taken from the program in Belgium, and which practically gave over to the organized workers of Belgium through their own organizations the power to control the funds for the unemployed, and thereby to control that army of the unemployed which is the most powerful arm of labor is used for suppressing the power of labor.

A DELEGATE: Is this to be in place of what we have been voting on in this convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is in addition.

A DELEGATE: At what place is it to be placed in the platform?

DEL. SIMONS: I believe it was put at the head of the demands. Comrade Hillquit, what was to be the position in the platform?

DEL. HILLQUIT: I think it ought to go at the very first because it is the most urgent matter at this time.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I have a substitute which I wish to offer and I would like to have the secretary read it, and thus save that time and get the benefit of it in discussing this matter.

ASST. SEC. REILLY (Reading):

"The government shall employ every willing worker, their hours and wages to harmonize with the scales established by organized labor for similar work. Our government by the right of eminent domain shall take over such property as may seem necessary to promote the general welfare, build, equip and operate railroads, own the postroads, mines, factories, and provide any other useful work sufficient from time to time to employ all who need and apply for work; that all work be paid for by the day, and no work be let out under private contract; that all money needed to put into effect the foregoing with all accessories needful for their successful operation be provided by congress in harmony with the United States constitution, which reads (Article I, Sec. 8): 'Congress shall have power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof.' All money issued for this purpose shall be full legal tender and paid by the national, state and municipal governments direct to the workers for services rendered. The na-

tional government to extend credit to the state and municipalities at cost. That marketable products be sold to consumers at the cost of production and distribution, and that the price to the public for services be practically the cost of maintaining and operating the same."

DEL. FIELDMAN: I move that this be substituted for the proposition offered by the committee.

DELEGATES: Second the motion. DEL. FIELDMAN: We write the platform not for ourselves alone, but for those who understand us; but nevertheless if we desire other men who are dissatisfied with existing conditions to join us, it is up to us to explain to them the remedies that we offer in such language and in such terms and with such clearness and detail that they will understand us and that they may thus see that there is really no difference between them and us.

A great deal has been said here to-night against immediate demands. If a platform were written for socialists alone we could sum it all up in one sentence, "Down with Capitalism; up with Socialism." But because we address ourselves to those who do not understand us, but who, if they did, would agree with us, it is necessary for us to so write and construct our pronouncements and platforms that they will grasp our aims, and so unite with us in crystallizing them.

And it is because the recommendation of the committee is couched in such language that you and I understand it, but the outsider would not grasp the full meaning of it; that I object to it in the first place; and it is because the report of the committee does not particularize sufficiently to make the question clear enough that I object to it in the first place; and it is because the committee provides for only one kind of work, and that is outdoor work, and everybody does not want to work outdoors, and in the third place I object to it because the committee does not show how it is to be done when it can be shown clearly by how it can and should be done—I object to it—and in the fourth place it is impractical because it does not explain the details that could be and ought to be explained; and I object to it because the substitute not only makes the question clearer, but it explains how these demands can be carried out in

harmony with existing laws, and for those reasons I stand for it from top to bottom. If I only had the time to compare it—how much more time have I?

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time will be up in one minute.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I hope and I promise that there are very few going to take the floor on this question, because I think it is very simple and I wanted to compare it paragraph by paragraph—but I shall submit it to you with pleasure after you have heard the author of this proposition.

Take the first clause: "We demand immediate government relief for the unemployed workers." Now I think this better: "The government shall employ every willing worker."

A DELEGATE: What is the difference?

DEL. FIELDMAN: There is an important difference. "Their wages to harmonize with the scale established by organized labor for similar work" That explains it in detail fully. Let us go further. "By building roads and canals, by reforesting the forests, by reclamation of lands, and by extending all other useful public works."

Now I want to say that this is far better: "Our government by right of eminent domain shall take over such property as may seem necessary to promote the general welfare"—"promote the general welfare" is taken from the constitution of the United States, which proves that it is taken out of the laws of this nation, already recognized and enforced.

Furthermore: "By building and equipping railroads and owning postroads." "Postroads" is taken from the constitution also, which shows that the government of this nation has the power to maintain roads, whether it be highways or railways—

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

DEL. RYAN (Ore.): I move that the time of Comrade Fieldman be extended.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I have worked all week on this thing. I have spent nights and days on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the time of the speaker be extended. Those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no. The ayes have it, and the time of the speaker is extended. Comrade Fieldman will continue.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I thank you. I have given a whole week to this proposition.

We want the government to engage in every kind of work. This substitute provides that we take over for this purpose not only the highways themselves, and the railroads, but the factories, or whatever other useful work may be necessary from time to time to employ all who from time to time need and apply for work.

"That all work be paid for by the day, and that no work be let out under private contract." Now you see here it is laid down that that is just outdoor work. It says "such work shall be directly done by the government under an eight hour working day, at prevailing union rates." I want not only the prevailing union wages and hours, but all the union conditions in every industry according to the regulations of the unions engaged in that industry.

Now we come to the second part of the report of the committee.

"The government shall loan money to states and municipalities without interest." The committee does not show us where the government has got the power to loan such money. We want the people to know that the government has the power to do these things constitutionally, and lawfully. This report does not show that. But here in the substitute on the other hand it is shown very clearly that all the money needed to carry into effect the foregoing with all accessories needful for its successful operation be provided by Congress in harmony with the United States constitution, which reads, Article I, Sec. 8:

"Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." This is taken from the constitution, and every American citizen who reads this, every American working man and working woman who can read and understand, or who comes in contact with this, will see from this that the government has the power to coin money; that the government may use that power in order to take over such work, and that that will make it possible for the government to employ every willing worker in the country; and that is what we are after.

We have got to make the American people understand that this government has the power now, constitutionally, if it wants to, to take hold of that work.

It is by comparison that we arrive at the truth. I only learn the truth or teach it upon the basis of contrast and comparison.

I want to reach my fellow man. I want to show him not only what is to be done, but how it is to be done. When I convince my listeners that this government of the United States has now the legal constitutional power to take over these industries that shall make it possible for this government to employ all the working men and working women so that they will not be forced to idleness—when I convince my listeners that the government has the power now to show them that the only reason the government does not use that power is because the capitalist class are in possession of the government. Then they will understand that if they will put the men of their own class in possession of the government, then that government will be used in their interests and they will soon see also that there is no need for unemployment, and then they will join hands with us and the Socialist Party will go on to victory.

DEL. DAN WHITE (Mass.): I support the substitute. I do this because while I am a man who desires for the Socialist Revolution, yet I do believe in engraving a plank of this kind in our platform. There is absolutely no abating one single jot of our enthusiasm for the overthrow of capitalism. But we have gone on year after year during this time of industrial activity through which we have passed and we have said to the workers: "There will come a time when circumstances over which you hold absolutely no control, will draw you into an industrial breakdown." We told them that; and they laughed at us. But we knew it, because we were students of economic conditions. The industrial breakdown came. During that period we never told them when they asked us: "What will you do?" other than to say, "We will capture first the powers of government and then usher in the new era by breaking down capitalism, and we shall benefit the workers thereby." Those were our words or words to that effect. Now that is not sufficient. Those who might be termed impossibilists here, and I think truly termed impossibilists, are talking about the triumph of Socialism. They want it. So do we. But they will never get it until doom

cracks if they go on in the way they have been going. We cannot secure the aid of the working class in capturing the powers of government unless we can give them something tangible, something that will respond to their immediate interests. Unless you can do that, to go to them is useless. We must be opportunists at least to that extent if we would awaken the working class to an interest in the Socialist philosophy. Down in Massachusetts we have been through the development stage. We understand that it becomes absolutely necessary to lay practical propositions before the workers. We have been successful in some cities in electing part of the city government. We have been able to enforce an improvement in conditions. We have been able under the authority of the municipality to broaden the scope of municipal activity, but whenever we did that they threw back the burden upon the workers by increased taxation, which in the final analysis they were forced to pay, and that taught us to do something different from what we were doing; and we found that it was absolutely necessary to make practical demands. In the neighboring town of Brockton, Massachusetts, they have been successful to some extent in developing the socialist vote, if we do not say its philosophy; but all the time the private capitalist interests in those towns are being impurged to go into Maine or into New Hampshire. They say, "Take our idle factories and we will give you freedom of rent, abatement of taxation, all those things that will enable you to come down here and cheapen your production," and thus it is within the power of the capitalist class to desolate any city or town of this country today under the private ownership of industry. With plans of that character going out and appealing to the working class, they would respond. I say again we want those to come to the Socialist movement who are not yet Socialists, and once having commenced to vote the Socialist ticket they would gradually begin to understand our philosophy, and they will evolve just as the majority of us have evolved to the position we occupy today. I believe that is one good step in the direction of interesting the workers by putting this plank in the platform of the national Socialist Party.

DEL. HURST (R. L.): I do not

wish to appeal to your sentiments or your propensities. I want your intellect. I want your thinking apparatus, that crowning jewel which man possesses above the brute and which makes him its superior. That is what I am appealing to during the five minutes, which is far too short for my purpose. I want to say to you that during this crisis, during the hardships which the people are now undergoing, they are asking the question which they ask of our national organizers and our speakers everywhere: "What can you do if we give you the power?" Now can you do anything? The capitalists have all the money. What can you do? Does anyone answer that question? No. I say the question should be answered. Has Comrade Hillquit answered that question? Has Comrade Simons answered it? True, he has with his ten given a scientific solution of the problem evolving from this system into the other system, but they have not answered this question and they never will until they offer a fundamental proposition like that embodied in this document. I say this question should be answered and I say the Socialist Party is the logical answer to it. Who else should answer it but the revolutionary party of the people?

This proposition does answer the question clearly. It provides not only a possible but a scientific and probable means of transition from the capitalist system to the co-operative commonwealth. That I can sustain on this platform against any of your superior intellects, and I would be glad to have the opportunity. It is constructive. It begins where you are. If I wish to get to that door I cannot take the second step first. If I am a commonwealth man I must take the first step first. I will not attempt to do anything else first. This starts from where you are and enables you to go from the present system to the co-operative commonwealth. It puts it so plain before you that he who runs may read and understand whether he be a Socialist or not. It is so plain that we believe you are going to vote for it.

It is revolutionary. What do you mean by revolution if it is not complete change? This will bring about a change methodically and thoroughly and efficiently and there will be no resisting

it and it will be absolutely irresistible in its march. It is utterly revolutionary if there is anything revolutionary. It is a class conscious proposition, absolutely so. There is nothing in it, nothing which can be read into it, which would imply that any other class under any conditions could extract anything out of it but the class who do the work. It is a class conscious proposition from which no other class can extract anything except those who do the work. Isn't it the class conscious proposition that we are looking for? Isn't it a working class proposition? This is what we have here and that is what we want to vote for, not a mixed up confusion.

Delegate Hurst's time was extended for ten minutes.

DEL. HURST: I thank you for the extension of time. Now this is absolutely an uncompromising proposition. It stands for no compromise. There is no resisting its onward trend. There is no sidetracking it. It is the one direction in which to travel and its conditions are laid down clearly.

Some will say you cannot do it while the government is in the hands of the capitalists. The capitalists will not grant it and therefore it is not practical. My answer to that is that we are making a great many demands that are not practical. But it is practical. It is practical to attract to men and educate them upon what we want. When a man out of work finds that there is a party that knows how to acquire those things and is willing to offer a remedy if given an opportunity, then he will turn against the parties who have that power and refuse to use it. He will not know where he knows how starvation can be avoided. It is because he has believed it impossible that he has been so patient and there is no reason why we should ignore these methods when we know that they are scientific, saying to these men, "Give us the power and then we will do what we promised to do." It is an honest proposition to offer a man. He wants to know how to do it. Your United States government does create money and does loan it to the national bankers at one-half of one per cent. On the first of May, 1908, the national banker was using six hundred and ninety-seven million dollars of that kind of

money. We are loaning it to the banker at one-half of one per cent. When the people of Chicago want to put up a three million dollar building they go to the banker and borrow the money back and pay five per cent for thirty years' loan. We put up the three million dollar building; we do all the work from foundation to roof, the workers create every particle of it—we create the money, we loan it to him at one-half of one per cent and then borrow it back at five per cent on bonds running thirty years, which makes four and a half millions in interest. We pay the banker for allowing us to use our own money. We have just as much right to pay that money to laborers for work as we have to borrow it and pay it to the bankers. You never had anything in the platform that will develop half the interest that this plan will, nor one that will scare the capitalist more. He knows that if this matter is discussed the whole scheme will be exposed. There is no reason why we should ignore this opportunity. It will expose those things and at the same time will lead right on toward the goal that we are striving for. When you put men to work and sell the proceeds at cost of production and distribution and you employ every man in that way eventually, where will the capitalist come in? Aren't they going to disappear when they come into competition with such a method as that? As they fall out of the capitalist industries they will fall into this and we will put them to work and without creating any confusion and without bringing about a cataclysm, something which everyone but an impossibilist knows will never happen. The change will come about by evolution. It is a great opportunity if we only know enough to grasp it.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): On the 10th of October, 1907, the bankers of New York decided that they would do something that the bankers of the world had never done before. They met and said: "The industrial condition of this country is so bad that we cannot save the banking business and the industrial business at the same time, so as we want to escape a deluge we will take a freshet," and they issued certain documents, and little prosperity took the dose and she has been in a comatose state ever since.

I want to say that this substitute is worth more than that whole platform, and every other immediate demand that you have put up here. I want to say

that this is the key to the situation. This is the central point of attack, because this resolution put before the people is an open challenge to the Republican and Democratic parties to reverse the situation if they can. In 1893 the Republican party said that the Democratic party brought on the panic, and the fool Democrats didn't have sense enough to deny it. They said, "Well, we were caught with the goods, what was the use of denying it." Now, nine-tenths of the Republican party don't believe that a panic could come when the Republican party was in power, but on the 10th of last October the panic had commenced, and now there are five million Republicans in this country who don't know where they are at and they are waiting to see which way to go. Now this resolution means something. It means if put in force that the panic would be broken. I believe it is the duty of every Socialist in the United States to ask every Democratic and Republican speaker when he is on the stump what is the cause of the panic and what is the remedy, and get his answer; and when you do, if he doesn't talk Socialism the people will know it and Socialism will get a hearing that it never had before.

I hope that this resolution will be adopted unanimously, and we will challenge the Democratic and Republican parties to battle, and when we win we shall, it will be a sweeping victory for the working class.

DEL. WOODYBY (Cal.): I want to find out from the last speaker where the constitution gives the right to take private property?

DEL. FRIEDMAN (N. Y.): What does the right of eminent domain mean?

DEL. WOODYBY: The right to take property with proper compensation. I have not got the information I asked for yet.

A DELEGATE: Did Comrade Hurst say that the panic was caused by the panic would be broken? (Laughter.)

DEL. HILLQUIT: I am very much afraid that if we adopt the substitute we shall do exactly the opposite of what we think we are doing.

There is not a man on this floor who is more in favor of practical immediate demands than I am. But those demands must be practical and the test of practicality is: is it enforceable? If we should get out a good, strong demand for the relief of unemployment and put

it up to the present government, and the present government ignores it, we are put in a position of advocating something for the welfare of the working class which the government rejects. If we put ourselves on record as demanding something impossible under present conditions we are on record as hot air theorists. I say make not only an immediate demand, but an urgency demand, a demand to be enforced tomorrow—a demand to be enforced to relieve the present existing crisis. It must be made in such a form that the government, if it had the desire, could actually enforce it. If it cannot be, we have not even made a propaganda, we have made ourselves a laughing stock for the nation.

Now, consider. Assume that we are in Congress. I am a representative, say of New York, representing the Socialist Party in Congress, and I move that the government shall employ every willing worker, affirming as a general principle he has the right to exist and the right to work, and demanding that as an urgency measure. I then proceed to state in what way it is to be done. I am compelled to show how to get the money. I say: "You have the power to stamp pieces of paper and call them dollars; therefore go ahead, make your dollars, and the unemployed working men will get the paper as wages."

A DELEGATE: Isn't that as good as any other money?

DEL. HILLQUIT: Oh, no.

A DELEGATE: Back of it stands the industry of the country.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Then you give go back to the greenback days.

A DELEGATE: Even if you do, what then?

DEL. HILLQUIT: I say that when you go before the working men of this country and say "Go to work for the government; the government will employ you all; and you will get paper which the government will call money," with nothing to back it with, I say in that case we make ourselves ridiculous before the working men of America.

It is proposed that the government by right of eminent domain shall take over property as the same may be necessary for the employment of the workers. That means to take over practically all of the industries in the United States.

A DELEGATE: Do you object to that?

DEL. HILLQUIT: No. But if I ask them to do that immediately, if I put that in as part of the Socialist platform, and go to the working men and say: "You are out of work, and there is an easy and practical method of giving you employment, to-wit: let the nation assume all the industries, print money and give all the working men work"—I say we should simply make ourselves ridiculous.

DEL. ANDERSON (N. D.): A point of information. I want to know from Comrade Hillquit if it is not the fact that the demand notes issued at the time of Abraham Lincoln were not full legal tender regardless of any gold back of them?

DEL. HILLQUIT: They were not at the time. They were just as good as paper currency, except it so happened that the United States subsequently made them good in the regular way.

DEL. ANDERSON: They were full legal tender and circulated at par.

DEL. BAUER (Cal.): A point of information. The resolution says that the goods shall be sold to the consumers at cost of production and distribution. I would like to ask would the men employed by the government come in competition with those employed by the capitalists?

A DELEGATE: They would.

DEL. BAUER: I think I can say all I want to say in three minutes. We know the secretary of the treasury loans money to Wall Street. We have the right to demand the same thing. Of course we have, but there is just one thing that we haven't got. We have the right, but we haven't got the might. We haven't the organized power to get what is our right. Let us recognize that it is just as easy to stand out for the whole Socialist proposition as it is to put through such immediate demands as that. What is the use of talking? Are we going back to the old greenback movement and thrash out the old money question again? I thought we had learned something in the last forty years. Apparently we have not.

I think, however, that we are taking ourselves too seriously. I know that we are all statesmen and scholars and philosophers. I myself have a stack of resolutions that high and I know they are better than any that are presented here, but I do not intend to present them tonight because it is getting late, but pre-



pare yourselves for the worst in the morning. I hold, however, in the course of evolution this party will arrive at the point where it is a working class party. I know that the tadpole in its evolution toward the frog gradually loses its tail and I hope that the Socialist movement when it finally becomes a true working class movement, will also lose its tail, these immediate demands. I thought we had sense enough now to chop off that tail. You may think you are making history with your immediate demands. Don't flatter yourselves. The Democratic and Republican parties will go you one better on every immediate demand. The reform movements will go you one better and there will come a time when you will have to occupy the only position which you are entitled to and that is the clear fighting position of the revolutionary Socialist who knows that he can get nothing except under

Socialism. Let it be whole hog or none. We will hew to the line. I move to lay this amendment on the table. I move to table the substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded that the substitute be tabled.

Cries of "Division."

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of tabling the substitute will raise their hands and keep them raised until counted.

The vote stands in favor of tabling the substitute 63; opposed, 45. The substitute is tabled. The question is now upon the adoption of the resolution offered by the committee. Those in favor of the adoption of the committee's report will say aye. Those opposed, no. The report of the committee is adopted. The convention then adjourned until May 16th, 1908, at 10 A. M.

## SEVENTH DAY'S SESSION

The convention was called to order at 10 a. m. by Secretary Heath.

Del. Bower of Illinois was appointed assistant secretary in place of Del. Strickland, who had to go home.

Del. Wheat of California was elected chairman for the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: In view of the experience of the past few days, a very brief sentence or two of prefatory remarks will be in order. I desire to say that in recognizing comrades who desire to speak, I shall use my judgment. I desire to say further that the amount of noise made by any delegate desiring the floor will have no influence upon the chair in getting recognition. I further desire to say that any comrade who after a decision of the chair has been rendered, persists in shouting at the chair or at the convention in defiance of the chair, will stand very little chance of catching the chairman's eye at any subsequent period during the day. The business before the convention this morning is upon the report of the Committee on Platform as a whole.

### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PLATFORM RESUMED.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I want to say this before I introduce the substitute for the immediate demands. I asked the chairman yesterday if this substitute would be in order at the conclusion of the discussion. I should have preferred to introduce the substitute at the time of that discussion and it would have saved, if adopted, all the discussion of yesterday afternoon and last night. I want the secretary to read it and then I desire to speak upon it.

ASST. SEC. REILLY (Reading): "The Socialist party when in office shall always and everywhere, until the present system is abolished, make the answer to this question its guiding rule of con-

duct, namely, will this legislation advance the interests of the working class and aid the workers in their struggle against capitalism? If it is in the interest of the working class the Socialist party is in favor of it. If it is against the interest of the working class the Socialist party is opposed to it."

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. OSBORNE: I think we are all opportunists when it comes to that, the only difference being that some of us are working class opportunists and some of us are middle class opportunists or capitalist class opportunists. I consider the entire program is an ultra middle class or capitalist class pronouncement. I recognize that there are two elements in this convention and naturally will be in all conventions. We do not all expect to see a proposition from the same standpoint, and the whole question, to my mind, is this; I should have liked to bring this up yesterday and decide which side of this question the convention stands, which would have saved time. I draw in my own mind the distinction between the part that the business man and the populist take in social evolution and the work of the working class in social evolution. I don't want to have to do any of the work that belongs to the capitalist class. They are doing that business well enough. Marx tells us that no social order can disappear until it has developed all the productive forces for which there is room within it, and that no society can appear until the material conditions for its existence have been created or are in process of creation out of the old society. I maintain that it is the business of the capitalist class to develop all the productive forces for which there is room in this society, and it is also the business of the capitalist class to prepare the material conditions for the disappearance

be in ninety years. There are a great number of states that require one year's residence, a number that require two years and a few that require six months' residence. I do not deem it necessary to make an extended speech on this question, because I believe that you are inclined to favor it and, therefore, I will not bother you any longer.

DEL. REILLY: I suggest that there be some age limit. You must remember that a person born in the United States is a citizen from the time of his birth.

A DELEGATE: I shall vote against that because of this fact. I do not believe that the Socialist party should take any position stating what length of time any member of the working class should have to live in any part of the United States before they can vote. The trade unions require no residence before they allow the members to vote. I think all citizens should be allowed to cast their vote wherever they happen to be on election day regardless of ninety days or any other time of residence. I don't think the Socialist party should go on record as fixing any time that a citizen should live in one place before he can vote.

DEL. PORTER (Neb.): I should like to add the word "territory" after the word "state."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection that will stand.

A DELEGATE: In our town whenever a corporation wants a franchise and the citizens are opposed to it, our corporations send over to Kentucky, just across the river, and they bring in negroes by car loads and ship loads and board them there thirty days and in that way most valuable franchises are grabbed by these corporations. In our state we have thirty days. If you make it five days you simply make it easier for the franchise grabbers to get everything they want. Therefore I oppose this.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): A point of order. The matter of franchise is a matter for state legislation entirely. It is for the state convention to take action on this, not for the national convention, because each state makes its own laws regardless of the franchise laws in neighboring states.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is not well taken.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): The comrade in front of me has raised a point which we in the large cities can

substantiate. There should be no resolution adopted by this convention or anything in the platform of this organization that disfranchises any part of the working class. It is part of the capitalist system in these days to prevent the working-class from voting. They are preventing you from getting the vote. They have to some extent prevented the working class from voting on election day. In Chicago and all large cities you will find that registration day is only an identification. If you set a time limit or if you were to make any limit, if you were to work into the hands of those who want to prevent the working men from voting. If this resolution goes through you simply add another club to the weapons in the hands of those who are anxious to deprive us of the franchise, to slug us on election day or throw out our vote.

DEL. SEABORN (N. Y.): I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded and carried.

DEL. RAMP (Ore.): I have listened to the speech of the comrade from Illinois against the amendment, and I would suggest to the Illinois delegation that they apply that argument to the whole immediate demand program. To those comrades who tell us that the capitalist class are going to take voters from one city to another, we reply that they are doing it and they have done it and they will do it. I tell you that they are expelling voters from one state to another. Two years ago in the town of Bisbee, Ariz., six weeks before election, six hundred of the workmen who were Socialists were driven out so they could not vote. They were disfranchised. Governor Waite, when he ran for the second term, was defeated by the same method. We have got to counteract these things that the capitalist class do to disfranchise our voters. I recognize that the comrades in eastern states have no conception of the difficulties that the western states suffer from in this direction. In the state you are liable to see a man from Montana in April, in Arizona in May, Colorado in June and California in August. There is continual moving about, and with these requirements of one and two years' residence they are disfranchised all the time, and as a Socialist, an impossibilist Socialist if you wish, I want to oppose that sort of thing. If the gentleman down here who made the

damnable speech a few moments ago—that is the man who makes the most obnoxious speeches who put in bills for sleeping car accommodations, while the real Socialists are compelled to sleep in water tanks and under hay stacks that I represent, and those men I am going to represent as long as I stand on the floor of any convention, and you are not going to frighten me into any submission to the intellectuals. It is good discipline that we are having rubbed into us here. I am not going to tell you that you are either too young or too ignorant, I am not going to call you any names, but I am satisfied to discuss this question fairly and honestly. But if you drive me to it I can call names as hard as you can.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. The gentleman is not talking about the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair rules that the point is not well taken.

DEL. RAMP: You know that I am opposed to immediate demands, but if we are to put in any immediate demands, for heaven's sake don't turn down the Western States on this proposition, which is a trade union proposition.

DEL. KORENGOL (Ill.): A point of personal privilege. I want to say that the gentleman misunderstood Del. Morgan entirely.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a matter of personal privilege. Comrade Morgan, like everybody else, is liable to be misunderstood.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I had hoped that it would not require any discussion to get this question before you. Away back in '06 I heard a man of no less eminence than General Howard, with one arm lost in the Civil war, standing before an audience make this declaration. He said: "If I had to make the laws regulating the franchise I would make a property qualification necessary for any man before he could exercise the right of suffrage; and with him on that stage on that occasion was Russell A. Alger, of Michigan, and other notable men. That burned its way into my being. I know something about the fellow who call a proletarian, and, my friends, I have slept both in a Pullman and under a water tank. Now, there is a meaning in the resolution. What we want is to poll all our votes, and are you going to refuse and reject this method of getting

it? You gentlemen tell us that the corporations import voters. Well, the corporations if they go on organizing industries to a point where you will have to industrialize them by your political action, why let them go on. Let us have it, but don't let us have a restricted franchise. Many Socialists of our country are disfranchised, and I believe it is proper for us to go on against the further disfranchisement of our fellow citizens. It is important that we declare ourselves on this point. It has been said that this is a national question. Certainly it is a national question, and this is a national convention, and the national convention should speak out. I think this resolution should pass. If it were in order I should like to make a further amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would not be in order.

DEL. BROWN: Then I will simply say as one of our boys said when he got in a scrap with his older brother, "It is not what you get that makes you fat; it is what you get." It is what we get that will make us fat, so let us get what we can.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I am opposed to the amendment for several reasons. First, the country has no business in a national platform, because it is a state matter. In the next place, it should not be passed, because it would affect different states differently. It would be a progressive measure in some states and a retrogressive measure in other states. It would be a good thing in one state and a dangerous thing in another, especially in the crowded industrial districts. I am opposed to it because we should not burden our program with too many minute detailed demands. There are over two hundred delegates here and each one has a certain pet measure, and if we all offer them and they are adopted you will have an unwieldy instrument. Furthermore, let me remind you that we have still four committees outstanding that we have spent a very large amount of time in deliberation on the platform, and I believe a true sense of proportion should dictate the wisdom of dispensing with much discussion where it is not really demanded. If we don't the danger is that important matters coming later will be passed without any deliberation.

A DELEGATE: I wish to speak against the amendment. It does not go

far enough. You establish a legal residence for traveling men of all kinds in order that they may vote in election. The capitalists provide for those; why should we not provide for our comrades? I think we should put in another clause and secure the vote for all our comrades.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question recurs on the motion of Del. Brown, of Washington. Those in favor of that resolution will say aye. Those opposed no. The motion is lost.

DEL. GOAZIOU (Pa.): I move that the original report that has been adopted by section by section be moved. (The motion to table was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the report of the Platform Committee in regard to immediate demands be laid on the table.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): A point of order. The convention has already adopted those various sections.

A DELEGATE: Does this include the entire demands, the industrial demands and the political demands?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the whole thing.

A DELEGATE: Would a motion to substitute be in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is that the program be laid on the table. Those in favor say aye. Those opposed no. The motion is lost.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I desire to offer a resolution to be embodied in the immediate demands.

THE CHAIRMAN: In order to do that you will have to move to reconsider.

DEL. STREBEL: I will simply submit it to your judgment and hope that a vote will be taken on it. I don't think that anything I can say in five minutes will change the preconceived ideas of any delegate. The resolution is as follows: "The abolition of the power of the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon legislation enacted by Congress as to its constitutionality. Legislation passed by Congress to be repealed or abrogated only by act of Congress or referendum vote of the whole people."

I move the adoption of this demand.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of that motion will say aye. Opposed no. The motion is carried unanimously.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I don't know whether I am in order or not. My purpose is this: I want to put before the rank and file of the party the preamble, platform and program, and at the same time, the platform that we had in the last national campaign, the two to go together to the membership for a vote. I make that now as a motion, that the preamble, platform and program submitted by the committee as amended, and the platform of the last national campaign, shall be submitted to the membership for a referendum vote.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): A point of order. The motion is to move to do that. We have already taken action upon the platform and it would be necessary to reconsider the vote of yesterday.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

DEL. SIMONS: I wish to move now the adoption of the entire report as amended.

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. MORGAN: I move the previous question.

The motion was duly seconded and carried.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I am opposed to this motion because I want this carried out in a different way. For twelve hours we have debated this matter of whether we are opportunists or impossibilists and whether we want or do not want immediate demands. I say that the rank and file should have the opportunity to vote on this matter. I say that most of the delegates in this convention are opposed really to this platform as it is adopted. They have taken something they do not want, to get something they do want. We have three thousand words, we have a preamble and platform that practically complicate themselves. Then when they come to the bedrock statement of principles it is very ineffectively put together. This committee has done its work faithfully. I don't want to cast any reflection upon them, but I think that we should take the report and submit it with the platform of the last campaign and let the rank and file decide which of these two is the most practical exposition of the Socialist philosophy.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I am opposed to the adoption of this populistish hash, unless something like this is placed at the head of it, and I hope the motion

will be voted down so that we may have a chance to consider its points. We have been told that the impossibilists, as we are called, are opposed to men having more wages now, or any benefits along the lines of these immediate demands until the Socialist party elects its candidates. Nothing could be more untrue, nothing could be more absurd than the position that these opponents of ours take. All of us who are called impossibilists are in favor of immediate benefits to the working class, but we are not in favor of bamboozling the workmen to give them. Now, to place before the immediate demands this proposition: "We call the attention of the workers of America to the fact that government ownership of public utilities, old age pensions for worn-out wage-slaves, and all other steps with reference to alleged benefits to the working class, can best be gained by rolling up a healthy Socialist vote, as has been done in the countries of Europe." We need not make any formal demand in our platform for any degree of state Socialism of doubtful benefit to the working class, because all that we need and more will be granted by our masters when our vote on election day shall become great enough to be regarded as a menace. Then many things will be given to the workers by the Republican and Democratic parties. All you want here you will get if you roll up a great Socialist vote and elect a few Socialists on your ticket.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Socialism is a phase of civilization, just as capitalism is a phase of civilization, just as feudalism was a phase of civilization. You will never be able to say "We will get together tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock and introduce the co-operative commonwealth." No one can tell the exact day or the exact year when capitalism commenced as an epoch of the world's civilization. No one can tell me the exact day or year when feudalism ceased—we find a great deal of feudalism in Europe even now. No one will ever be able to tell the day or year or even the decade when Socialism will begin to rule the world. Conditions are changing constantly. We are constantly working toward Socialism. It is continuous steady work. Next year, or ten years, or twenty years, or a hundred years, from now, we shall perhaps still be working toward the completing of

our civilization—toward Socialism. The position of the impossibilist is a very easy one. All he has to do is to learn a few holy words and then stand on the street corner and shout. It is the cheapest thing in the world. Our impossibilists are practically anarchists who are too cowardly to admit it. I have heard this shouting of blessed words before. Talk about proletarians and factory workers—if you look over the delegates here you will find that most of the impossibilists came from states where they see the factory worker when he comes down the strike picket line. You will find that impossibilists come from states where factories are less frequent than moonshine distilleries. They come from states where Socialists are rare birds and where our party polls no vote.

A VOICE: How about California?

DEL. BERGER: In California you impossibilists have ruined our movement. Take the states of Illinois, New York, Wisconsin—they are solid against impossibilism. This platform is not an ideal platform, of course. Where there is a committee made up of men of varying views the report will always be more or less patched. This platform does not satisfy me exactly, neither did the platform four years ago. We did the best we could. But we did something. But did you ever see an impossibilist do something? Except talking and calling those who do something bad names. To cut out the immediate demands would mean suicide for the party. It would make this party an impossibilist party, and an impossible party. So much for the freaks among the impossibilists.

However, some of our impossibilist friends are well meaning and honest. But they are simply old populists who became sore at the "immediate demands" because the Democrats stole their party with the 16 to 1 platform, and they have been sore ever since. (Applause.) The Democrats stole the Populist platform easily enough, but it was not that steal that ruined populism. The economic conditions got to be such that the farmer received a dollar per bushel for wheat, in gold and not in silver. That killed the populist party, which was a farmers' party. It was not the stealing of their thunder by Bryan. However, ever since there are lots of those populists around looking for a party. Some of them have cut off their beards, learned a few So-

cialistic phrases and now they are imperialist Socialists.

Comrades, this party for a long time must be a proletarian city party, made up largely of the city element. The proletarian factory elements must dominate it and are going to dominate it, although we want the friendship and co-operation of the farmers. I hope the farmers will very soon have a political class organization of their own and then those of our ex-populist friends who don't like our city party can go there and let their impossible heads row again. We must have a working program for our party and we are going to have it.

DEL SIMONS: I want to make a little explanation on behalf of the committee. In the first place, I think the thing is not fully understood. There are three parts to this platform. It is not the most perfect platform that every single person on the Platform Committee would have liked to see. It had to be hurried through within two days, or we would have taken longer, so that we had the alternative of turning it in here as you have it there or throwing it on the floor.

There are three parts, as you notice. The first is called the preamble, although I have very little use for the name. I think there ought to be one declaration of principles. The preamble is offered to you as a sort of permanent statement, a thing that can be kept on the wall of those Socialist papers that wish to keep some regular statement of Socialism in their columns all the time, whether followed or not by the immediate demands. I believe Berger will consent that the comrades of Washington and Oklahoma shall print that portion at the head of their paper and not say anything about the other if they do not feel like it, although they may want to talk about it. But as a matter of fact, this is a declaration of principles. Personally I believe the other parts are of equal or more importance.

The second portion is intended as what is ordinarily called a platform, an indictment of present conditions.

And having explained Socialism, and having indicted present conditions, it is then for us to say what we propose to fight for, what we want, and there we say to our comrades that in Chicago and New York and Milwaukee and St. Louis, wherever there is a great city, we are fighting not on the soap box alone.

There is no single day in the last year and a half that there has not been a bitter fight on of some kind in the city of Chicago, on which the Socialist party had to take some party action, on the soap box, in the paper, and wherever it had any chance or place to fight. We were in the fight, we were in the class struggle, and not talking about the class struggle. (Applause.) And because of that fact, because of the fact that we have got fights here all the time, because this battle is on here, we want you to adopt this report of the Platform Committee as a whole, with its declaration of principles, its indictment of present society, and its program of the things that we are going to fight for.

Now, it is said against this that we ought simply to say that when we elect people to the legislatures or anywhere we should make the question of the attitude and the effect of any measure on the working class their standard of action. I prefer that this convention shall decide what is in the interest of the working class rather than that a committee shall. (Applause.) I believe in democratic rule. I believe in the rule of the rank and file, and I think we are to have a larger representation of the rank and file here in this city or state, that we shall have some men elected to the legislature or the municipality, and it is for us to say here what is to the interest of the working class and what is not to the interest of the working class. (Applause.) We want to show what the class struggle is, so that when our speakers go to the people we may be sure that they know what that means. Let us see that they know what they are talking about, and that they tell the people what something besides hot air. (Applause.) And, therefore, I want to ask you, comrades, that when this comes to a vote you vote to adopt the report of the committee, and then refer it to a committee to smooth out the language, and you will have had both reports before you, and when it is published you can see it, so that the committee cannot do any juggling with it. So I ask you to adopt the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question is now to be put.

DEL WILLIAMS (Minn.): I move that the vote be called by roll-call. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is any useful purpose to be served by the roll-

call, of course the convention can have it if it wants it. It consumes almost twenty minutes to take the roll-call.

DEL SIMONS: I rise to a point of order. It takes a majority to call for the roll-call. We are all on record on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as are in favor of the motion to adopt will say aye. Opposed by the same sign. The motion is carried.

DEL MORGAN (Ill.): I move that the rules covering the discussion after the previous question is moved be changed.

THE CHAIRMAN: You desire a reconsideration?

DEL MORGAN: Yes, so that no one can be heard except the chairman of the committee whose report is under consideration. If I get a second I will tell the reason why.

The motion to reconsider was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that after the previous question has been ordered it be the rule of this convention that no one but the person offering the resolution or the chairman of the committee offering it shall have the privilege of speaking.

The motion was carried.

Del. Maynard moved that the report of the Woman's Committee be the first order of business after adjournment. (Seconded.)

Del. Solomon moved to amend that the report of the Committee on Constitution be the first order of business, on the ground of its greater importance. The motion was seconded and carried as amended.

## INTERNATIONAL SECRETARY.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): A point of order. On Monday, I believe, the convention voted that it would elect the Secretary to the International Socialist Bureau. That was, I believe, regularly on the order of business about two days ago, but was, as the chairman for that day informed me, inadvertently missed. My point of order is that the election of the Delegate or Secretary to the International Socialist Bureau should be taken up.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be taken up right now, if you like. It lacks ten minutes of adjourning time yet, and we can dispose of it in ten minutes.

DEL. LEE: We are to elect a Secretary to the International Socialist Bureau; that is to say, a representative of the Socialist party of America in what we may call the central committee of the Socialist party of the world. We have a secretary representative in that body already in the person of Morris Hillquit, who has served there since the last convention. I nominate Comrade Morris Hillquit for that position here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further nominations?

It was moved and seconded to close the nominations.

There being no further nominations, the chair declared the nominations closed, and Del. Hillquit was then unanimously elected.

## COMMITTEE ON EDITING PLATFORM.

It was moved and carried to elect a committee on the literary features of the platform.

Lee, Simons and Berger were elected.

The convention then, at 12:40, adjourned until 2 p. m.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman Wheat called the convention to order at 2 o'clock.

## CANADIAN FRATERNAL DELEGATES.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I wish to move that the first order of business tomorrow morning to be to hear from the fraternal delegates from the Dominion of Canada.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Del. Branstetter called attention to the omission of the name of Del. Wills of Oklahoma from the ballot for the election of a Committee on Farmers' Program, and the delegates were requested to make pencil corrections accordingly.

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Constitution has the floor. Will the delegates listen to the Committee on Constitution?

Del. Gaylord, of Wisconsin, chairman of the Committee on Constitution, then made the following report on behalf of that committee:

DEL. GAYLORD: I think the committee may be permitted a word by way of preface. We realize that some of these matters may not be agreed upon. The majority of the committee have agreed upon some things, which, frankly, we do not expect the convention to accept at this time, according to reports that have reached us; but we have used our best information and our best thought, and what we recommend is, we believe, in line with an efficient organization. If you decide otherwise, it is for you to do so.

Section I, article I, is the same as the original.

## Article I.

Section 1. The name of this organization shall be the Socialist Party, except in states where a different name has been found to may become a legal requirement that it was moved and amended that the article be adopted. Carried.

Article II, section 1, was read as follows:

## Article II.

Section 1. Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen and upward, without distinction of sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist Party, shall be eligible to membership in the party.

DEL. STARKWEATHER (Cal.): Instead of the two words "distinction of" I wish to insert the three words "discrimination as to." It will then read, "Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years and upward, without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed."

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make a motion?

DEL. STARKWEATHER: I make a motion that this change be made. The amendment was seconded and carried.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): I wish to offer another amendment to the same paragraph. I offer this amendment on account of something that came up in our local a few weeks ago.

I move to amend by inserting so as to make it read as follows: "without distinction," or as amended by the comrade, "of sex, race, color or creed, who is not on the unfair list of organized labor." (Amendment not seconded.) Now, in a few words I will explain my position. For nine months last year we had a strike in Bisbee, not for the closed shop, but for the open shop.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me a moment. Do I hear a second to the motion?

The amendment was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

DEL. CANNON: We had a strike not with the closed shop, but with the open shop.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): A point of order. The amendment would let in several democrats and republicans.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is not a point of order.

DEL. MORGAN: Yes, it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is an argument on the question.

DEL. CANNON: After the strike

—that strike was to give us the privilege of working if we had the little red card of the Socialist Party in our pocket, and if we had the union card in our pocket that was all right. We struck. When the strike was over those people who had been unfair from beginning to end and wanted to go out to the world with a clear reputation made application in the Socialist local, and I am sorry to say that at a packed meeting on one occasion one of them was admitted into membership in the Socialist Party, although it was done by unfair means, and that man is free to go anywhere in the United States. You all know that the little red card of the Socialist party is an evidence of membership, of comradeship, a respectable document to show anywhere, and I just want to keep it that way.

DEL. MORGAN: I move to lay the amendment on the table. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of laying the amendment on the table will says aye. Opposed, no. The chair is in doubt as to the result of the vote. Those in favor of laying the amendment on the table will raise their hands.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): Does the chair rule that when the amendment is laid on the table that carries the section with it?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, the amendment is that after the word "creed" there be introduced "and who is not unfair from the labor union point of view."

DEL. STRICKLAND: I ask for another reading of that.

DEL. CANNON: "Who is not on the unfair list of organized labor."

THE CHAIRMAN: "Who is not on the unfair list of organized labor."

As many as are in favor of laying the amendment on the table will raise the right hand and hold it up until counted. Those who are opposed to laying it on the table will raise their hands. There is no need of counting. The motion is carried and the amendment is laid on the table.

DEL. WILKE (Ga.): I move that we insert the words "or her" after the word "his." In other words, if we adopt it, it will read "without distinction of sex, race, color or creed,

who has severed his or her connection with all other political parties."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second? No second.

It was moved to lay the amendment on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no second to the original motion.

DEL. STIRTON (Mich.): A point of information, if the chair can decide or if there is some grammarian present who can decide this for me. In connections such as this I think that ordinarily masculine nouns are used, but they are common nouns in gender. Is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will state that ordinarily it is understood in what is called the generic sense.

DEL. STIRTON: That is what I wanted to state.

THE CHAIRMAN: They include both sexes. That is ordinarily understood. However, that is a matter for this convention to decide.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I desire to offer an amendment to section I of Article II, striking out the following words: "of the age of eighteen years and upward." (Seconded.) In support of that amendment, comrades and fellow delegates, I desire to say that I am acquainted with a number of cases of young men and young ladies who are intelligent and earnest students of the Socialist philosophy and who desire to affiliate with the party and bear their just proportion of the expense of the maintenance of the organization, and who ought to be permitted to join, but owing to this provision in the national constitution they are unable to do so. In the interest of the organization and for this purpose I offer this amendment, and I hope it will carry without any discussion.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the delegate over there. I think if we do anything at all we ought to extend the age limit and not cut it down. Now, this is a political party to a very large extent, and there is hardly a state in the Union in which a man can vote before he is at least twenty-one years of age, and by this amendment you are going to make our party composed of little boys and girls, sixteen,

fifteen, fourteen and thirteen years old. If we can get the young people interested in the Socialist movement let the comrades organize them in Sunday schools or otherwise and bring them up to become Socialists, and when they get to the age of eighteen they will understand the philosophy of Socialism and they will be a help to us, and not have little boys and girls in the party organization. (Applause.) Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, this is no child-play affair. This is not an admiration society. We go in to do certain work, and this party is organized to do certain work, and we want to have grown people to do the work. We don't care to have children in the party, but when they grow up they will be ready to become members of the party.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was carried.

DEL. KRAFFT (N. J.): I move that the word "twenty-one" be substituted for "eighteen." (Seconded.) I give you to understand that our members participate in the primaries, and if we make nominations of boys of eighteen our nominations will be contested. We must have men twenty-one years of age.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move that that be tabled. We are tired of this child's play. We don't want a kindergarten.

The amendment was laid on the table.

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I wish to ask the committeemen why they did not bring these objections up while they were in the committee, instead of delaying matters now. This man was on the committee.

DEL. ANDERSON (Minn.): I move to adopt the report as amended.

The motion was seconded and Section 1 of Article II was adopted as amended.

The next section was read as follows:

Section 2. Any person occupying a position, honorary or remunerative, by gift of any other political party (civil service positions excepted) shall not be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party.

It was moved and seconded that the section be adopted.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): A point of information from that committee. One time in my state, Oklahoma, I found a man who was holding a commission as a notary public, and when we brought the attention of the State Committee to that fact there was a question raised. I want to say to you that he is a good Socialist and has been the secretary of the local ever since he has been a member of the party, and that is more than two years.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are desiring information as to whether the position of notary public is a political position?

DEL. ROSS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear from the chairman of the committee.

DEL. ROSS: Mr. Chairman, my party.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, let us get the information. Never mind what your party did.

DEL. ROSS: No, but here is what I want to say. It was brought to the State Committee; I brought it up as a state committeeman. One of the committee replied that the National Executive Committee ruled that it was not a political gift.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us hear what the opinion of the chairman of the committee is.

DEL. GAYLORD: In the opinion of the committee such an office—well, I cannot speak for the committee, since the matter did not come up in any of our sessions, but if you ask me I would say that generally the office of notary public is not considered a political office.

DEL. ROSS: That is what I wanted to know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to this section?

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I move to amend by substituting the words, "elective or appointive," before the word "position."

DEL. GAYLORD: A notary public is appointed.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no second.

DEL. ANDERSON (Minn.): I move to amend in the third line of Section 2, after the word "any," by

inserting the words "party other than the Socialist Party." In some states we put up tickets that don't declare for Socialism, and we are not clear whether that is against our laws or not. I move to adopt the amendment. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the chair state it as the chair understands it.

DEL. ANDERSON: I will read it if you wish.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, read it as it should be.

DEL. ANDERSON: "Section 2. Any person occupying a position, honorary or remunerative, by gift of any party other than the Socialist Party (civil service positions excepted), shall not be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party."

The amendment was carried, and the section as amended was adopted.

The next section was read:

Section 3. A member who desires to transfer his membership from a local in one state to a local in another state may do so upon the presentation of his card showing him to be in good standing at the time of asking for such transfer.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): That should be "from the party in one state to the party in another state." There are members at large in several states.

DEL. GAYLORD: Where do you insert, and what do you insert?

DEL. McDEVITT: A member who desires to transfer his membership from the party in one state to the party in another state.

A DELEGATE: That will not make any provision for transferring from one local to another local in the same state.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a matter for the state constitution. As many as favor this say aye. Opposed. The motion seems to be carried. It is so ordered.

DEL. HAZLETT (Mont.): I would like to amend by inserting—I think the application card of the party should have a phrase which states that each one who signs that card shall believe in political action, and I would like to speak if I can get a second. I have not stated it very clearly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish the delegate would get that in a little more definite order and find the ex-

act place where it ought to go, and then we can go on with something else.

DEL. HAZLETT: I have it in the form of a resolution, but not fixed to go in there as a condition of membership in the party, and that is what I want.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you get it in words that will be coherent to the convention?

DEL. HAZLETT: If I do that will I have a chance?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will recognize you then, yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: I will say to Comrade Hazlett that that would belong properly in Section 1 of Article II.

DEL. HAZLETT: It will be inserted in Section 1?

DEL. GAYLORD: That is where it should be, if it goes in. Prepare it for the purpose of introducing it.

DEL. HAZLETT: I will.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will give you a chance later on.

The next section was read:

Section 4. No member of the party in any state or territory, shall under any pretext interfere with the regular or organized movement in any other state. Adopted without discussion.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I wish to add a clause. There is a very conspicuous vacancy in this article, and that vacancy is in regard to the membership pledge. We had an article in the old constitution which read something like this: "All persons wishing to join the Socialist Party must sign the following pledge," and the pledge was inserted in the constitution, and that pledge belongs in the constitution, and move that this article in the old constitution which deals with that pledge be inserted in this constitution as a separate section. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have it as Section 5 of Article II.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I like to add a point of order, that that does not state the article in the old constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair rules that as the point is technically sustained, but not—

DEL. SLAYTON: It does not ex-

ist. How can we introduce a certain clause in the old constitution which does not exist?

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I have a copy of the old constitution, and I cannot find any such passage at all in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the comrade from Washington desire to renew his motion under another clause?

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Yes, I make the following as an amendment to a separate clause in this article to read as follows:

Section 5. All persons joining the Socialist Party shall sign the following pledge: I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class and the necessity of the working class constituting themselves into a political party distinct from and opposed to all parties formed by the propertied class, hereby declare that I have severed my relations with all other parties, that I endorse the platform and constitution of the Socialist Party, and hereby apply for admission to said party.

Amendment seconded.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): There was a section adopted a while ago which provided that those who apply shall give up their membership in any other party.

DEL. REYNOLDS (Ind.): Section 1, Article II, covers that whole amendment which the comrade over there offers, and I move that we lay this on the table.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): Does the motion of the delegate from Washington come before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is before the house, and there is a motion to lay it upon the table.

DEL. GERBER: Then I second the motion to lay on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is already seconded. As many as favor it say aye. Opposed, the same. The motion to lay on the table is lost.

DEL. GERBER: I ask for the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: This comrade (Del. Work) has the floor.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move to amend by striking out the expression

"propertied class" and insert the expression "capitalist class." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the amendment, that the words "propertied class" be stricken out and the words "capitalist class" be inserted.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): A point of order. There is a motion before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a motion to amend the motion before the house. It is proper and in order.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): You provide a certain general provision in this constitution, and then you want to provide how to carry it out, but you don't provide forms. If you want to do so you can in the first clause provide the form of application blank.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will excuse me, I will ask you to speak simply to the question as to whether you prefer "capitalist class" or "propertied class."

DEL. SLOBODIN: Can't I speak on this question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not until the main question is settled.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I don't think we ought to be in there "propertied class" or the other word either, because there may be a party formed that does not consist of the propertied class; they may have a union labor party, and we want to vote against them the same as we want to vote against any other party; therefore I oppose that.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS moved the previous question. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If the comrade will hold it in abeyance for a moment I will get the motion.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): Wouldn't it be better to say, "all"?

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order. As many as are in favor of the amendment will say aye.

A DELEGATE: Which amendment is that?

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment of Comrade Work, to substitute "capitalist class" for "propertied class."

DEL. POPE (Mo.): A question of information. I think that would have reference to the propertied class and other classes.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, some one suggested that, but the convention took no action.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): A point of information. I would like to be informed, if this amendment is defeated or accepted will the main question then be open for debate?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

DEL. GERBER: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as are in favor of the amendment say aye. Opposed, no. The amendment is lost.

DEL. GERBER: I rise to speak on the main question. I am opposed to the motion or to the clause offered by the delegate from Washington. I am opposed to it for the following reasons: I do not think it necessary for the constitution to prescribe every little form that will be used in our organization, because all that is necessary in our constitution is to state the qualification for membership of any one who applies for membership, and Section 1, Article II, defines that, explicitly. It says, "Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years or upward, without distinction of sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist Party, shall be eligible to membership in the party." So that implies that when the application is made we will have the question in it that I state that I have severed my connection with all other political parties, that I do subscribe to the constitution of the Socialist Party, that I do subscribe to the platform of the Socialist Party, and therefore am eligible to membership in the Socialist Party. If I cannot do that I am not eligible. Hence it is unnecessary for us to waste time here and waste space in our constitution, because it is a matter of detail for our National Secretary to get the application blank up.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I favor the proposed new article or new section, for the simple reason that the pledge of membership should be uniform in all the states and the national organization should decide what that pledge of membership shall be, and not leave it to each state, perhaps to

have a different clause; but it is simply to have uniformity in the organization that I favor it. We have had it before and it did no harm. Let us continue the same.

DEL. GUY WILLIAMS (Minn.): In answer to the remarks of the last comrade that spoke, it seems to me that it is unnecessary for us to go into all the details of the executive duties of the executive officers of this party. It is left in their charge. The function of this convention is not as executive one, but as legislative one, and I believe we ought to leave to the executive officers the matter of drawing up all the different forms and other things of that kind that are necessarily the function of the executive branch of the organization.

The previous question was moved. Del. Bradford of California took the floor.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I rise to a point of order. I moved the previous question and was recognized by the chair and it was accepted, and I have yielded to but one member to speak.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

A DELEGATE: I make a point of order that the question was not put when he offered it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken and the chair will decide that we are to vote now as to whether the previous question shall be put. As many as want to put the previous question say aye. Opposed, the same sign. The motion is carried.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I do not agree with Delegate Williams of Minnesota. I think we need a little more than our National Executive Committee, and even our National Committee, this convention does. Now, it is not a question as to whether or not the first section of this article states the qualifications for membership, but it is a question as to whether or not we shall have a pledge, an official pledge, a constitutional pledge, a pledge provided for in the constitution, so that no state can say, "This is our pledge," when that pledge may not be a pledge that is in conformity with Socialist Party principles, according to the constitution at present. By that I mean this, according to the

constitution of the Socialist Party, with that pledge left out, anybody can say he believes in our principles and can thereby become a member without any other qualifications.

(An interruption.)

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: I will speak my full five minutes, if you please.

DEL. GAYLORD: Of course you will. Go on.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Thank you. It seems to me to be the opinion here that the different state organizations can take into the party anybody they please. Now, I say we should have a uniform pledge. We should make the person who wishes to join our party sign this pledge. We should make a person who wishes to join our party understand that the only way he can join our party is by signing the Socialist Party pledge. Now, the only way you can make this positive is by making a law, and the only way you can make a law is by including a pledge in the constitution.

Question called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: According to the motion that was passed with reference to the previous question, no other speaker would be in order. As many as are in favor of the amendment offered by the delegate—

A DELEGATE: A point of information. Has the National Executive Committee done away with the pledge cards entirely?

DEL. SLOBODIN: No, we have got them anyhow.

DEL. KUNATH (Ind.): I ask if this pledge that has just been read is not the uniform application card that is issued by the national office?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is the regular pledge, which seems to be not provided for anywhere else in the constitution.

DEL. GAYLORD: I want to ask the comrades or the chairman if anybody can answer whether the adoption of this would compel the Social Democratic Party of Wisconsin to use this form. We could not use it there. What would we do? The name of our party is the Social Democratic Party.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Use

the pledge with "Social Democratic" in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair would suppose that Section 1 of Article I would necessarily cover that point.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): According to that pledge I will have to sell my house and lot before I can get into the party.

THE CHAIRMAN: In answer to that I will say that we have all signed that pledge, every one of us.

DEL. KERR (Ill.): A question of information. Is it not true that the proposition of the comrade from Washington is but a reiteration of our pledge that we have already signed, all of us?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Let me state; I will answer you. It is precisely the effort, as I understand it, of the comrade who introduced the resolution, to get a pledge into the constitutional law of the party.

DEL. KERR (Ill.): Yes, that is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as favor the motion offered by the delegate from Washington say aye. Opposed, by the same. The motion is carried and it is so ordered. The committee will proceed.

DEL. HAZLETT (Mont.): I want to ask for information. You said that before we got through with Article II, I might present my amendment, and this is the place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily. At any time when you have it finished, any particular time you ask for the floor I will see that you have it.

DEL. HAZLETT: This is the place to put in my amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you absolutely ready?

DEL. HAZLETT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then we will hear Comrade Hazlett.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): Before we pass to Article III?

THE CHAIRMAN: Nothing is in order but the matter of Comrade Hazlett of Montana.

DEL. HAZLETT: I move that the first section of the article on membership shall be changed to read this way: "Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years and upward, without distinction

of sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist party, including political action, shall be eligible to membership in the party." That every application for membership shall also include specifically that clause, belief in political action. Also that there shall be a section added to the membership article, a penalty clause to read like this: "Section 6. Any person who opposes political action as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation, shall be asked to withdraw from the party."

Amendment seconded. The reading of the amendment was received with applause.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair rules that the motion really includes three propositions, and with the consent of the mover and of the convention I would like to divide the motion. The first covering the amendment to Section 1; the second covering the amendment to the pledge, which would be our newly adopted Section 5; and the third, the Section 6 which is proposed to be added. Now, if the comrade will confine her remarks to the first part of that we will get that disposed of, and pass on and take them up one by one. They are really three propositions.

DEL. HAZLETT: I will do so, if I may be allowed to speak on each one, especially the last.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): A point of order. The convention has already adopted an amendment as to discrimination in sex.

THE CHAIRMAN: She did not take that into consideration, but that is a matter which we all understand, as to the "distinction."

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move the previous question on the first clause.

Motion seconded by Del. Berlyn.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair would rule that Comrade Hazlett has the floor.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): She has the floor on the previous question, anyhow.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, she will have the floor afterwards, anyway.

You can yield if you want to right now. As many as favor the previous question, say aye. Opposed. It is so ordered.

DEL. HAZLETT: I simply want to state that when the time comes I wish to speak to the motion on the last part, on the necessity of having the phrase "political action" in the application and in the constitution. It seems to me that if we have this all persons who join the Socialist party will take a pledge that they believe in political action, and then if they interfere with that pledge in any way, if they violate that pledge we can then bring the penalty part of the motion that I made. That is all I have to say on that matter.

ASST. SEC. REILLY read the pending amendment, as follows:

"Moved by Hazlett of Montana to amend Article II, Section 1, to read: 'Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years and upward, without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist party, including political action, shall be eligible to membership in the party.'"

The amendment was put and carried.

ASST. SEC. DEL. REILLY: The second amendment of Comrade Hazlett, if adopted, would read the same as the amendment offered and adopted from Comrade Wagenknecht, with the exception of the pledge that the applicant would sign, that "I endorse the platform and constitution of the Socialist party, including the principle of political action."

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Question called for.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): A point of information. Have we any other action except political action in the Socialist party?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as are in favor, say aye. Opposed, the same. The motion is carried and it is so ordered. The secretary will give us the third proposition.

ASST. SEC. REILLY: The third proposition is to add a new section, to be known as Section 6, that "Any



person in the party who opposes political action as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be asked to withdraw from the party."

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I oppose that amendment for the reason that any person who deliberately violates the constitution of the party cannot be asked to withdraw, but should be expelled, and I am opposed to any clause in the constitution that makes it optional with the various states to ask such a member to please kindly get out of the party. I therefore move to amend the motion or amendment, whatever it may be, to read that "any person violating the pledge or the clause of the constitution with regard to political action or any other action shall be expelled from the party." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment is made and seconded. Discussion is now on the amendment. Will the Secretary read the amendment?

DEL. HAZLETT: It seems to me if this means that if any person violates the pledge in the amendment already adopted on political action such person is to be expelled, I will accept the amendment if I am allowed to speak on this amended clause.

DEL. SPARGO: I would like to ask whether that means if the amendment is in the terms offered by Del. Solomon?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. SPARGO: The terms offered by Del. Solomon are not as satisfactory, but Comrade Hazlett accepted them. It is not a question of any member violating the principle of political action, as I understand, but that any person opposing political action shall be expelled from the Socialist party. I believe that Comrade Solomon will accept that wording, and Comrade Hazlett will.

DEL. HAZLETT: Yes.

DEL. SPARGO:—that any person opposing political action shall be expelled from the Socialist party.

DEL. HAZLETT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment, then, is in the form stated by Comrade Spargo. Comrade Hazlett has the floor.

DEL. SMITH (Tex.): I wish to ask, would an amendment or a sub-

stitute for the whole be in order? We have now a motion, and an amendment to the amendment.

DEL. HAZLETT: I accepted in my motion the amendment.

DEL. SMITH: I want an amendment to the amendment be in order, then?

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment is in order if the comrade has one to offer.

DEL. SMITH: I wish to amend the amendment to read that no state organization nor local organization in an unorganized state shall retain any member in its organization who has violated that clause of the constitution pertaining to the qualifications as regards political action. I do this because under our constitution the national organization would have no power to decline or rather to expel any party member.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Spargo, may I ask you, isn't that virtually all covered in your statement?

DEL. SPARGO: I merely ask that the motion and amendment be reconciled.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes; but isn't virtually all that the comrade states here covered in your amendment?

DEL. SPARGO: I think so.

DEL. HAZLETT: I wish to speak on my motion.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): A point of information. I would like to ask the chairman whether all the delegates here would have to sign another application? The obligation in the Socialist party does not declare for political action.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no information that can be given, I think. It is a matter of private opinion, like religion. (Laughter.) It is not a question that I can answer or that anybody else can answer, but it is a matter of opinion. Del. Hazlett has the floor.

DEL. HAZLETT: Comrade Chairman and Comrades: While this is a new departure, I presume, in the history of the constitution of the American Socialist party, to present a penalty clause, I think we should do so because of the necessity that has arisen within the Socialist party itself. There has been some trouble in certain parts of this country already with

a very decided tendency to do away with the ballot as a means of emancipation of the working class. Especially in the locals in the western part of this country, those under the teachings of the Western Federation of Miners and the Industrial Workers of the World, do we find the party membership advocating direct action in place of political action. (Applause.) I have found this in a recent trip to the west. I have found it through the Nevada locals. I have found it in some of the mining locals, and I have found it on the coast; even to such an extent that certain persons in the local of Butte, have pointed with scorn to our members who are advocating the political party and have called them maniacs. I wish to say, since this has come up, since we are scorned for advocating the ballot, there is such a menace in that I have heard persons speak on the coast—and one of the men is in this convention, who was a speaker for the Socialist party—that would stand up and say to a crowd, "We don't ask your votes and we don't care whether we have your votes or not." Now, since this is the condition we face, this condition that is spreading, the demand for direct action, saying that we will get nothing by the ballot and nothing can be achieved by the ballot, I say it is the direct child of those revolutionary tactics (applause) by which they do want to do anything by political action in existing society. I wish to have the constitution of the American Socialist party so framed that we can send out the word to the locals throughout the country so that they will know, when any man gets on the floor of a local and begins to sneer at political action, that we shall have a guaranty of his expulsion from the party. (Applause.)

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): Comrade Chairman and Comrades—

A DELEGATE: What's the matter with the women?

DEL. PREVEY: Let us get cooled off a little while and get our reasoning faculties in working order. What are we here for, in the first place?

A DELEGATE: Political action.

DEL. PREVEY: We are here as the representatives of the political

party. We are drafting a constitution in order that we may carry on the political party. When anyone signs an application saying that he subscribes to the principles of the Socialist political party, what in the name of common sense is he subscribing to? I would be ashamed to have the constitution of the Socialist party go out from this convention with a lot of superfluous language tacked on. (Applause.) I want an opportunity to speak on this clause before it is adopted, but owing to the fact that a whole lot of people here seemed to want to get up and show that they could make a Socialist speech, we wasted a lot of valuable time. (Applause.) Please don't applaud; I want all of my time. And now we are rushing through the most important part of this convention and drafting the means by which we are going to carry on the work of the Socialist party. In the name of common sense, let us give this careful consideration, and do not, in an important part of the work of this convention, in the constitution, make babies of ourselves. This is what clause that we are amending—

THE CHAIRMAN: We are on the addition of a new clause.

DEL. PREVEY: I believe the addition of a new clause. With the permission of those delegates, the addition of a new clause is directly concerned with what we have just adopted. I cannot make a motion, but I hope some other comrade will after I get through talking. The first clause I want to read because it bears a certain relation to the amendment that we are considering; that is why I want to read it: "Article II, Section 1. Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years and upward without distinction of sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist party, shall be eligible to membership in the party." What in the name of common sense have we got "party" in there for, if we don't mean political party? (Applause.) Why are we tacking a whole lot of superfluous language on there? It would read this way: "Subscribes to the principles of the

party, and who believes in political action." When we sign the application it means that we subscribe to the principles of the political party, and if there are any in the locals anywhere that do not believe in political action it is the duty of the comrades to throw them out of the window or somewhere else. (Applause.) Don't let us be babies, and I hope some comrade will have the good sense to offer a substitute for the whole. I cannot do it because it would not be according to parliamentary law. I move a reconsideration.

DEL. BRADFORD: A question of personal privilege. I do not desire to take up the time of the convention, but I feel that in justice to the California delegates and our constituents I should state that I do not know any of our brothers who are guilty of what Ida Crouch Hazlett has charged, and I do not believe it is true.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): If it is the desire of this convention to give the national organization jurisdiction over individual members, admitting them into the membership of the party or expelling them from the membership of the party, I think the constitution should so declare and it should be drafted with that end in view. But until now our constitution has no such provision. It was not contemplated to give the national organization jurisdiction over the members. In the state autonomy clause, it was provided that the respective states should have exclusive jurisdiction over individual members (applause), and the national organization should have jurisdiction over the state only. (Applause.) You can provide in your national constitution that the state constitution shall include certain sections, and if they do not include them you can expel a state or discipline a state. You cannot discipline any member under the present constitution that we are working under or under the constitution as it was drafted by your committee. You cannot discipline a member of the party except a member of the National Committee or of the National organization. I wish Comrade Berger had taken a tumble to himself. If we were working under that clause he advo-

cates now there would have been at a certain time in the history of our party a motion made to expel him from the party, because outside of the State of Wisconsin he would not be a member of the Socialist movement, of the Socialist party. I do not know whether at the present time I am opposing such a mode of procedure or advocating it, but I say that is what that provision tends to, that is what it does. It says a member who acts in a certain way shall be expelled from the party, but you provide no mode of expelling him. What will you do? You cannot tell the State of Wisconsin or the State of Montana to expel a member, for if the State of Wisconsin or the State of Montana refuses to expel, what can you do? Nothing. You have jurisdiction of the state. You can expel the State of Montana or the State of Wisconsin, that is all. Now, I say that under the scheme, under the principles involved in this constitution as to state autonomy, we should have no section providing for the expulsion of individual members of a state organization, but leaving that to the state organizations and we should reserve to ourselves jurisdiction over the state organizations. If a state does not act as we have provided in this constitution, then we can take care of the state. The second proposition I oppose, as to political action. That is a matter of opinion, just as much as religion is. (Applause.) A man may be in our party and advocate anything he pleases. So long as he expresses an opinion merely he is not liable to expulsion. He is only responsible for acts; if he votes for the other party, or refuses to vote the Socialist party ticket when he has an opportunity to do so, and if it is shown that he has done so. But we are not in a position to force him to take political action, and if he goes to his local and says, "I do not advocate or I am opposed to putting up a ticket at this time," and he votes so, he is not liable to expulsion, because then it is a question of opinion, and I would not expel a man for expressing his opinions. I am not in favor of adopting a clause in the constitution that a man may be expelled for expressing his opinion. Therefore I am

opposed to this amendment. (Applause.)

DEL. GOAZIOU (Pa.): I am opposed to the amendment offered. Whenever I get tired of political action I will withdraw from the Socialist party, and every honest man should do the same. (Applause.) Now, I believe in political action, but if political action will only be to secure votes and elect a few men to office without having Socialism in view, then you will have more people who will be opposed to political action. A statement has been made by the comrade from Montana that there is a great number of people who are becoming opposed to political action, due to the fact that there is more opportunism in the Socialist party today than yesterday. (Applause.) If you will watch our movement from today on you will find that as opportunism grows, the opposition to political action will also grow. (Applause.) A few weeks ago I made a tour of the eastern states and the New England states where there was a large number of people who had just come from France, and we found that nearly every one of them was an anarchist, and every anarchist we found coming from France had come from the cities where we have had Socialist municipalities. They have come from the center of opportunism, where the Socialist party has been used simply to get office for a few individuals and not to further Socialism. (Applause.) And just as this has grown in France and every other country, you will find that opposition to the ballot will grow in this country. But I hope that if that day ever comes when I shall become opposed to political action, I will have the honesty to say, "My friends, I part with you and will not wait to be expelled from the Socialist party." But I hope that that day will never come, and that I shall continue to be a Socialist, trying to get Socialism and not office for a few individuals.

DEL. BARZEE (Ore.): I want to call your attention to the fact that this convention has been run by the intellectuals in this convention all the way through, and the further fact that you will find that the member-

ship, the proletariat, will themselves come here and destroy this thing four years from now. They will carry it into their home locals, and you will feel the pulse on what you are doing here before this is through.

DEL. LAURA B. PAYNE (Tex.): I am sorry that the feeling has arisen in this convention that we find here. It is more imaginary than anything else, and when we try to draw the dividing line between the opportunists and the impossibilists, the impossibilists are telling the opportunists that they are impossibilists, and vice versa, and they hardly know where they are. So far as that motion is concerned, I think it is absolutely unnecessary. Political action is understood, and I never heard that question raised before in my life concerning the political party, the Socialist party. I am constantly in the field and I know many others that are, and we are trying to induce the working people in every way to vote in their own interest, and that means political action. You have put it down here that black is black, and then down a little further you have to explain that black is black. It seems to me you have unnecessary words there and that you have put in something insisted on by a portion of this convention which is really unnecessary, even for the purpose for which you intended it, for you cover all political action that you need without that in there, and I think it would look better and sound better with that as it used to be, and I say just leave it out. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade chairman and comrades, there is a growing tendency not only in this country, but in other countries, to deprecate political action. That tendency you can see in Italy and France, even in Germany to some extent, although less there than anywhere else, and in this country. The syndicalists in their fight in political action. They call themselves Socialists and are members of the Socialist party. There is a strong element, or was at least, in this country, doing the same thing, and I have heard it pleaded many a time right in our own meetings by speakers that come

to our meetings, that the only salvation for the proletariat of America is direct action, that the ballot box is simply a humbug. Now, I don't know how this question is going to be solved. I have no doubt that in the last analysis we must shoot, and when it comes to shooting, Wisconsin will be there. We always make good. (Applause.) But I want you to understand that that is not a question for this party to decide.

A DELEGATE: That is right.  
DEL. BERGER: We are to have a political party.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. BERGER: And we want to keep out of the party everybody who is not in harmony with our main principles and who is opposed to the fundamental idea of the party, which means the ballot box. In order to be able to shoot, even, some day, we must have the power of the political government in our hands, at least to a great extent. I want that understood. So everybody who is talking to you about direct action and so on, and about political action being a humbug, is your enemy today, because he keeps you from getting the powers of political government. They talk about the opportunistic movement in Wisconsin, saying that they are bourgeois. Now, I want you to understand, brothers and delegates, that there is not a party in this country anywhere that is as clearly proletarian as the party in Milwaukee. (Applause.) Ninety-five per cent of our entire membership and of our voters are clearly trade union and laboring men, so much so that we have not even enough of the middle class, not enough lawyers, to fill our offices; so much so that from now on, if we are to grow, we must get some of what you call the middle class and intellectuals; although I will say that intellectually our movement in Wisconsin, and particularly in Milwaukee, is probably better educated than anywhere else in the country, for the simple reason that we do it all by literature. (Applause.) We have no soap-box orators. My oratory is a sample, you know. We do it by giving them Socialism, by giving them facts. We do it by literature, and lots of it. So, as far as education is

concerned or the principles of Socialism and the ability to talk on every question that comes up of every kind from a Socialist point of view, there is no party in the country that is as well educated as the Milwaukee party, although it is clearly proletarian. (Applause.) I will say this: if this was only a particular case, I would say it was sufficient to leave it out. But the spirit of anarchy and the spirit of impossibilism is growing in this country. I am not going to address myself to our friends, the populists, because I know they will be all right now, similar to the syndicalists in the old country; and therefore, in order to state our position right in the beginning we ought to have this in the constitution. I beg you to accept the amendment of Comrade Hazlett, but in a way as to make it compulsory on the state to expel a member, and so as to keep the principle of state autonomy under which our party grew to such fine proportions intact.

DEL. BAUER (Cal.): I wish to say one word against the proposed amendment, and it is this: this amendment can be directed only against one class of people.

A DELEGATE: The anarchists.

DEL. BAUER: Wait a minute; I am going to say what I want to say. The men who are honest and sincere, who want to join our party which is a socialist party—we do not have to have an iron-clad contract, and have them swear on a stack of bibles that they are going to vote for the ticket and support the political party. So that the amendment cannot apply to the honest and sincere; it can only apply to those who attempt to get into our party and who are insincere. It is known, and I maintain, that you cannot by a membership pledge of any kind control those who are insincere and dishonest; they will sign anything you may frame—the Pinkerton spy, the anarchist, if you please, or the impossibilist if you please, if he is insincere. The dishonest will come in anyhow, and you will have to fight it out inside of your organization.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move

the previous questions. (Seconded.) THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question will now be put. As many as favor it say aye. Opposed by the same sign. The motion is carried and it is so ordered. Del. Hazlett has the floor.

DEL. HAZLETT: I do not care to make a speech at all on this, because I have stated all my reasons for it. The things that have been said show that the amendment is a proper one. Comrade Bauer said that the persons in the Socialist party who are advocating direct action and who are decrying the ballot and political action are persons who are insincere and in the pay of citizens' associations, and spies, and so forth. That is not true. I will say of my personal knowledge that there are many people that are my friends, men I have known for many years, within the ranks of organized labor in this country, and that I do not think there are any in any place in the Socialist party who are more sincere or who believe what they say more than these men who are today advocating direct action. They are doing it because of the wrong teachings in our party.

DEL. YOUNG (Pa.): A point of information. I ask for a definition in English of "direct action."

A DELEGATE: "Anarchy."

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the phrase occur in the amendment?

A DELEGATE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: It does not occur, and therefore the question cannot be asked at this time. The question now comes upon the adoption of the amendment, which is the addition of the sixth clause or section to Article II. The secretary will read the section.

ASST. SEC. REILLY: It is to add a new section to be known as Section 6 of Article II, to read that "any member of the party who opposes political action as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the party."

The question was put on the adoption of the amendment, and, a division being called for, it was adopted by a vote of 82 for and 48 against.

DEL. BRADFORD (Cal.): A

question of personal privilege. I do not desire to waste the time of this convention, but there has been a statement made here which, in manifest fairness to the comrades here and to the members of the movement in their state, we desire and we deserve an answer or a designation from the comrade on this floor who has made that statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the statement that you refer to?

DEL. BRADFORD: A statement was made by Comrade Ida Crouch Hazlett that one of the members of the California delegation here present practically has repudiated direct action in his public utterances and taken a position for which one of our members in California is now under suspension from the party, and for which, if we allow this thing to be ignored and to have no statement of it in the convention, we will go back and be seriously handicapped in our work. I know I speak in behalf of several comrades here of the delegation, and I think I speak in behalf of all of them, in asking Comrade Hazlett to designate that member of our delegation.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. There are no charges made here unless they are made in writing, I understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade from California raises a point which the chair must permit, not because the delegate comes from California, but it seems to me in justice to any delegation, and the chair must ask the comrade from Montana, Comrade Hazlett, if she is willing to name the person in the California delegation to whom she referred, and give him an opportunity to either affirm or deny the charge.

DEL. ANDERSON (Minn.): A point of order. I do not believe the comrade said he was in the California delegation. She said it was in California.

DEL. HAZLETT: I do not wish to get any delegate or delegation in trouble at all, and I do not think I referred to the California delegation. I said in my speech, as far as that delegate was concerned, the delegate was a personal friend of mine and he has

not said any more than many persons in our party have said.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is whether you have here referred to the California delegation, and are you willing to say who?

Objection was made by different members.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I object to the answer. I call for the regular order.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): A question of personal privilege. I want to be recorded in the minutes as voting in favor of the resolution just carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you send your name up?

A delegate made the point of order that the California matter was out of order and ought to be settled outside of the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair desires to say that it is a question of personal privilege if, the comrade did refer to California. If she did not refer to California it is not a question of personal privilege.

A DELEGATE: I object. It is not in the province of the California delegation to ask whether reference was made to any of the delegates present, as comrade Hazlett did not name the California delegation.

THE CHAIRMAN: If Mrs. Hazlett would say that one thing, whether she said California or not, it will settle it.

A DELEGATE: She is not asked to say it.

Objection by various delegates to any further proceedings in regard to the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: A true question of privilege has been asked. Did Mrs. Hazlett say California or did she not?

DEL. HAZLETT: I did not say California.

THE CHAIRMAN: That settles the whole matter.

DEL. BARZEE (Ore.): A question of personal privilege and explanation. I am a member at present of the Socialist party. We have passed in this resolution or part of the program a provision that any person opposing political action shall be expelled from the party. I want to know what "opposition" is, so that I may be able to stay in the party.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please don't

ask questions that I am not competent and no one in this convention at this time is competent to answer.

DEL. BARZEE: The question was passed upon.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not here nor is this convention here at this present time to interpret these matters. The order of business is to adopt this constitution or reject it, and any question as to what is in there is proper, but questions of opinion, questions of court decisions, we will not entertain.

Del. Gaylord then read the first section of the next article, as follows:

### Article III.

Section I. The affairs of the Socialist party shall be administered by a National Committee, its officers and executive committee, the party conventions, and the general vote of the party.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? If not it is ordered adopted. Proceed.

The next section was read:

Section 2. Three years' membership in the party shall be necessary to qualify for all national official positions.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I wish to insert the word "consecutive," so as to make it read "Three years' consecutive membership." (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: The committee will accept that.

There being no objection, the section as amended was adopted.

The next article was read:

### Article IV.

Section 1. Each organized state or territory shall be represented on the National Committee by one member and by an additional member for every 2,000 members or major fraction thereof in good standing in the party. For the purpose of determining the representation to which each state or territory may be entitled, the National Secretary shall compute at the beginning of each year the average dues paying membership of such state or territory for the preceding year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

DEL. DAVIES (Pa.): I move to strike out 2,000 and insert 1,000. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment made and seconded that 1,000 be substituted for 2,000.

DEL. DAVIES: I am not going to take up any time, but I think 2,000 is entirely too much for the present strength of our organization. There are comparatively few states that have more than two National Committees, and not many at that. The average membership in any one state throughout the whole union, even excluding those unorganized, is not much more than 1,000, and you are going to have some weak states and you are going to have them with as much representation in the National Committee as the strongly organized states. Take, for instance, Pennsylvania or Ohio, states which have around 1,000 members. You are going to have some comparatively insignificant numerically states having as much strength in the National Committee as those two. I am in favor of 2,000 when we have reached that stage. But I claim that we have not reached the 2,000 stage yet. I believe in time you will have 10,000 or 50,000, but that day is not yet. I think, in order to give states such as Pennsylvania, Ohio, Massachusetts and so on, a fair representation in the National Committee in proportion to their membership, the only way you can do that is to retain it at 1,000, so that the states with but two or three or four hundred members will not be as strong in the National Committee as those other states.

DEL. KUNATH (Ind.): Then increase your membership.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is one other item which I wish to call your attention to in the constitution which affects this, namely that we do not ask to have this constitution go into effect until the first of January, 1920. Second, we believe in the growth of this party. The party has been growing very rapidly in the last six months. We expect it to grow very much more rapidly in the next six months. The work of the National Committee is conducted by correspondence very largely. We ask that this be inserted for the sake of the effectiveness of the officers in the work of the National Committee.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I want

to correct Comrade Davies when he states that a state which has but 400 members will be entitled to the same representation on the National Committee as Pennsylvania, with 1,000 members. That is not so. A state that has got only 400 members, according to this clause, will be entitled to one National Committeeman, and the state of Pennsylvania will be entitled to two. A state that has more than 2,000 members and less than 3,000 will be entitled to two National Committeemen. A state that has got more than 3,000 will be entitled to three.

The amendment was lost, and the section as reported was adopted.

The next section was read, as follows:

Section 2. The members of this committee shall be elected by referendum vote of and from the membership of the states or territories which they respectively represent. Their term of office shall not be more than two years. The members of the National Committee shall be subject to removal by referendum vote of their respective states.

It was moved to adopt the section.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): In another section, in Article VI, it says, "they shall hold office for two years." Here is a positive statement that says that their term of office shall not be more than two years. Why not have them more alike? I move you that in this section just read we change it to read, "Their term of office shall be two years." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the phraseology be that the term of office shall be two years.

DEL. SLAYTON: I want to explain why that is that way. The National Committeeman is a state officer. The constitution says he shall not hold office for more than two years, meaning that that leaves it to the state convention and organization to provide if they want to that he hold office for only one year. But the National Executive Committeeman is a national officer, and therefore the constitution prescribes what the term shall be.

The amendment was lost, and the section as reported was adopted.

The next section was read:

Section 3. The National Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so.

Adopted without objection.

The next section was read:

Section 4. Expenses of the National Committee in attending meetings shall be paid from the national treasury.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection it will be adopted. So ordered.

A DELEGATE: What does that mean, "expenses?"

THE CHAIRMAN: It means all expenses.

The next section was read:

Section 5. No motion shall be submitted to a referendum of the National Committee by correspondence unless supported within thirty days by not less than five members of the National Committee from three different states.

#### Minority Report:

DEL. GAYLORD: On this point there is a minority report. You will find it in the first section of the minority report. It is recommended by Comrade Bell, and I think also Comrade Snyder. It reads: "To eliminate from Section 5, Article IV, sixth line, the words 'from different states.'" It would then mean that five members from any state or states could support a motion for the referendum by correspondence and it would go to the ballot.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that the minority report is moved as an amendment. It is now up for discussion.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): I move that the report of the majority be adopted. (Seconded.)

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): Wouldn't this mean that it would be before the National Committee for thirty days?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it says "within thirty days."

DEL. GAYLORD: Just as soon as there are five supporting members from three different states the vote can be taken.

The motion to adopt the majority report was carried.

Section 6 was read, as follows:

Section 6. The National Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with the provisions of this constitution.

Adopted without objection.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I would like to say with reference to Section 3

in regard to the National Committee meeting, that it should specify in what way they shall do business, whether by majority rule or not. But I presume Section 6 will cover that.

DEL. GAYLORD: That will cover that.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection it is adopted. So ordered.

At this point the chairman announced that the ballots on the Committee on Farmers' Program and Committee on Immigration could be collected, and they were accordingly collected.

The chairman of the Committee on Constitution then read Article V, Section 1, of the proposed constitution as follows:

Section 1. The duties of this committee shall be to represent the party in all national and international affairs; to call on national nominating conventions and special conventions decided upon by the referendum of the party; to make reports to the national convention; and to receive and pass upon all reports and actions of the Executive Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to this section? I hear no objection and it is adopted as read.

The chairman of the committee then read Section 2 as follows:

Section 2. The National Committee shall neither publish nor designate any official organ.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? I hear no objection and the section is adopted as read.

DEL. GAYLORD: Article VI—under this first section there is a minority report. I will read the section first as reported by the committee:

Section 1. The National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members, elected by the National Committee from the membership of the party, and they shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and elections shall be issued in the month of November of even numbered years.

Under this section there is a minority report to the effect that there should be struck out from Section 1, Article VI, the words "the National Committee" and substitute therefor the words "referendum vote."

DEL. CLARK (Tex.): I move that the minority report be adopted.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the minority report be adopted.

DEL. CLARK: The reason I make the motion is because we as a party claim that the Socialist Party is a democratic party, and stands for the election of our officers by the referendum. If we are a democratic party let us stay with those principles and let us stand against any effort that looks like—I don't mean that the majority report intended to do it; I don't say they had it in their mind, but it looks like we are drifting toward the centralization of power, and let us strike at anything that even looks as if it had a tendency in that direction; let us stand as a party that is ruled by the majority and assert that the rank and file have the absolute right to say who shall be the National Executive Committee. Let us hold this thing down to the rank and file and not let the power be concentrated in a few hands, not build up something that smacks of a political machine in the Socialist Party.

If we let the rank and file control we shall be all right, they are the only ones who will always guide us right and if we take away from the rank and file the least part of their powers we are treading upon dangerous ground, and I think we ought to substitute the minority report for the majority report. Let us stand for the rank and file and let them have a voice in this matter. At least I hope you will adopt that minority report.

DEL. PREVEY: I want to speak in opposition to the amendment; not that I am in favor of the National Committee electing the National Executive Committee so much, but because I believe the manner in which the election of the National Executive Committee took place the last time we elected one was too cumbersome, too expensive and took up too much of the valuable time of our national officers. Comrades, I believe in democracy in the party but I also believe in a practical democracy; I believe in a democracy with which we can do business. I believe we can carry this worship of the name democracy to a point where it is supremely ridiculous. We use up the funds of the party, take up the time of our officers who should be doing propaganda work making them do this sort of thing

when they ought to be engaged in more important work.

I am not afraid of the members of the Socialist Party. I do not think that any delegate to this convention should be afraid of the Socialist Party. We always have the power to recall an officer; we always have the right to initiative and referendum and we can recall any of our officers at any time. I don't think we should be so suspicious of each other.

I am opposed to the amendment because I believe we should concentrate our efforts as much as possible in harmony with Socialism to the propaganda of Socialism rather than waste so much valuable time in electing officers.

I was in Chicago when the national office was compiling the work connected with the work of electing the National Executive Committee. I know that they had to work until 2 o'clock many mornings to compile that vote. It was also very expensive.

I am opposed to the amendment, but I had hoped that the committee would bring in some plan, something better than the election of the National Executive Committee by the National Committee. But I believe that we should vote down this amendment and some of us should offer something as a substitute, better than the amendment and better than the majority report.

But this amendment would simply leave the situation as it is now. I am opposed to it for that reason, because I don't want to use up our forces in electing our officers.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I have in mind to move presently, in order to meet Comrade Prevey's suggestion, that supposing this minority report is adopted, that the committee be elected by a referendum, but from nominations made by at least ten branches. That will obviate the difficulty presented in the arguments of Comrade Prevey.

I am very much in favor of democratic management of the Socialist Party, and therefore, not to take your time in making a longer speech, I am in favor of the minority report and when it is voted upon I want the floor to move this proposition, that the members of the Executive Committee to be elected by referendum shall be nominated by at least ten branches.

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL (Ill.): I am

not a business democrat. I want Social democracy, not business democracy. I do not want the National Committee to have too much power over the party. I want the rank and file to elect both the National Committee and the Executive Committee; and if we put into the hands of the National Committee the power to elect the National Executive Committee we have no power over either committee. One will wash their hands of the other and the other will wash their hands of the first. I want to get rid of the sort of thing we have had in the past, and for that reason I am in favor of social democracy and not business democracy.

They talk about expending money. The money comes from the rank and file and not from the committeemen. They are engaged to do the work of the party and if they don't want to do the work of the party they can get out. For these reasons I shall vote for the minority report.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): There is such a thing as democracy running wild. It is also not always advisable for members of little or no experience in party affairs to have the same voice as members who are experienced.

Cries of "Good" and "No," "No." DEL. REILLY: For instance, in the state where I come from, we won't allow a member of the party to vote on a state referendum on less than six weeks' membership.

The National Executive Committee is really a body that is created for convenience merely to transact business that the National Committee itself otherwise would transact; and in its very nature its acts must be subject to the approval of the National Committee. I respectfully submit to you that if the National Committee is to pass upon the acts of the National Executive Committee, the National Committee should also pass upon the election of that body that is to transact its business.

Now, comrades, there is another point. I deny that under the referendum system the rank and file of the party have been choosing our National Executive Committee. When I say this I do not wish to be construed as making a personal attack upon anybody. But under the last time that we elected a National Executive Committee, The highest candidate upon that ticket only received a vote of one-sixth of the mem-

bership of the party. He undoubtedly received a plurality of the votes that were cast, but, comrades, you cannot get a referendum on a matter that makes it as cumbersome as the election of the National Executive Committee is bound to be and have it efficient; you cannot get the majority of our members to leave their more important work to vote upon the election of the National Executive Committee.

DEL. CLARK: I move the previous question. DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): Everything that has been said against democracy and against the referendum has been said every time by every one who was ever interested against people taking part in or taking care of their own affairs.

A DELEGATE: I object to such an insinuation.

DEL. TUTTLE: I have not made any insinuation. If I have I would like to know what it is. I object to any such insinuation unless you back it up with proof. I want it understood that I stand for democracy in this movement.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. The gentlemen are not discussing the question before us; they are quarreling.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate is discussing the matter before the house.

DEL. TUTTLE: I am doing the best I can and you will excuse me if I can't do any better. I am opening myself to you and you can judge of me all the better. They said here upon the platform that we are not really electing our officers by the referendum, and when we proved that we were, then they tell us we should not do it anyhow. What kind of a thing is this, that we can't do it and are not doing it, that we have done it wrong, and we can't do it anyhow? I am in favor of doing it and I don't care how cumbersome it is. I want the people to have the right of referendum. I am not afraid of this today, but I am afraid of it tomorrow. It is not what we are doing today that I fear, but it is because we go in and chop out this path, this calf path, and that is the path set for us to take and because the sheep walk through once we all follow. I don't want a precedent set, that there is anything better than the referendum and therefore I stand

for the referendum and I am going to vote for the minority report.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): The cheapest way to get popular with the masses is to get up and shout and scream and get yourself red in the face crying: "Hurrah for the people;" "Hurrah for the rank and file;" "Hurrah for the referendum."

I have voted for real democracy in the Socialist organization longer than some of those who are shouting so much for democracy. I have had spittoons hurled at me because I stood for it. I have also studied democracy and I have arrived at certain conclusions, which I express without the mechanism by which it can express itself defeats its own end. Democracy to be efficient must find a mechanism by which it can express itself. That is the first principle of scientific democracy. It is the people who have come from other organizations into the Socialist ranks who sometimes make these mistakes.

I stand for democracy just as much as any of them. I do not doubt the sincerity of those who talk so loudly for democracy, but I say it again that we must find a means by which this democracy can express itself and change its expression whenever it wants to.

Here you have a scheme of organization in this constitution. You have the National Committee with its members elected by the rank and file. They are also removable at any time by the rank and file. You go farther and you find from experience that the National Committee is the committee that must transact the executive business of the National organization and therefore you determine that the National Committee shall have its Executive Committee.

Executive Committee was elected by the referendum. At that time I said and still think that it is not the best way of electing. But I was denounced up and down the country as an intellectual, and you, comrades, can see how wrong that accusation was. What was the result? Your National Executive Committee elected by the referendum vote assumed the function of a legislative body. It did more than the National Committee ever assumed to do. It passed resolutions of a fundamental character, on questions of principle, binding upon the Socialist Party. It assumed to instruct the delegates in the

International Congress and to pass upon questions that would come up there. Yet they have no more to do with legislative work than had your national secretary. But they assumed to pass upon questions of principle. Why? Because it was exalted in its own estimation by the fact that it was elected by a referendum vote. That came from the fact that you elected for the same purpose two committees with co-ordinate powers and not one subordinate to the other, because the National Committee is in charge of the party organization and the National Executive Committee was also. So I am in favor of the report.

DEL. WOODBY (Cal.): It seems to me that this whole thing can be amicably settled by having the National Committee, which is elected by a referendum, elect its own executive committee from its own number and let me explain what I mean by that. Every one of us is elected by the referendum who comes to this convention. We come to this convention and then as a method of doing business we select certain committees who are to expedite our work. But we select them from those who have already been elected by a referendum. Now, if the National Committee, which is elected by a referendum, in its method of doing business is allowed to elect its own executive committee, but from its own number, we then secure all those are arguing about it seems to me, without the necessity of taking a further referendum to elect the members of the executive committee.

I would like to see the Executive Committee elected from the National Committee, and made responsible to the National Committee, so that the National Committee, if it did not like the work of the Executive Committee, could undo that work, just the same as if we don't like the work of a special committee of this convention we can change its work from the floor of the convention or dismiss them altogether and select another committee.

It seems to me that in that way we secure all that we want on both sides without the expenses and cumbersome work of electing a national executive committee and yet have the executive committee responsible to the National Committee.

If the two committees differ from each other now, then the National Com-

mittee has no power whatever to reverse the action of the Executive Committee, if they are at loggerheads. Do you understand me?

Suppose we had committees to take care of our business that we cannot very well handle in committee of the whole, if we have no power to dismiss that committee at all, and we get here at loggerheads, then we can accomplish nothing at all.

I want to repeat it again, so that you can see what I am after. Elect the National Committee by referendum and then have the National Committee, merely as a method of doing business select from those men that the people have already elected by referendum, an executive committee responsible to them for their action. It seems to me that secures the whole thing. I would like to offer as a substitute for both the minority and the majority report: "The National Committee shall select its executive committee from its own membership."

DEL SNYDER (Kan.): As one in the minority I wish to speak in favor of the amendment. It is said that I am a crank, but I desire to say that if there is any difficulty with the rank and file it is because they have not had the opportunity to practice democracy enough. The officials have too much power because democracy is not spread enough. I know of no other way to get practical democracy to have the rank and file better than to have this idea of the referendum spread among them. I don't care how many times you send out a referendum to the rank and file, it does some good. It helps to educate the membership in looking after its officials. If you put into the hands of a few men the power to elect their executive committee and their financial secretary and so on, you put it out of the hands of the rank and file and eventually they will do with that just as they do with their state secretaries and others; they will let them do all the work and lose sight of the organization. This keeps them acquiescent, and that long list of names—I think we have 25 names submitted, but they get the rank and file acquainted with the membership of the Socialist Party, with the leaders of the Socialist Party of this country and it does more in that way than anything else you could think of.

I say I am in favor of keeping the

power in the membership of the party as far as possible, and I believe we should strike out "National Committee" and substitute "Referendum vote."

There is no use in talking. Any person who knows the power that rests in the officials of our party today knows that the officials have too much power. Today I could throw the whole state of Kansas into absolute confusion for the next year, I could simply start one whole campaign, because it is in my power as state secretary to put out the whole vote at the present time, at a time that comes before the primary next August. There is only the time between now and the end of June, and the membership could not possibly find me out in time if I saw fit to do that. So I want to get them so well acquainted with the officialdom of our party so that no such situation can ever come by some officials acting improperly. It is for this educational feature that we ought to keep this in. Let us first get real powerful democratic action before we put too much power in the hands of our officials. I am for the minority report.

DEL SPARGO (N. Y.): I desire to speak in favor of the election of the National Executive Committee by the members of the National Committee whose executive body it is to be.

I am not at this time disposed to admit that there is that danger of despotism, from officialdom in our Socialist Party. I say if it is true of Kansas, or of any other state in this union, then it is time that the comrades in those states began to mend their fences. But it is not true of the National Organization of the Socialist Party.

I say to you, comrades, that so far as our State of New York is concerned, for example—and I don't not that that state representative of the vast majority of the states—no man who is state secretary can override the wishes of the membership of the party.

Now, to the question. What is it that we have to face? Why do we have a National Executive Committee? We have a National Committee as the legislative body of our party between conventions. That National Committee is too large, too unwieldy to carry on all of its business efficiently. For one thing, it is too expensive for the party membership to bring them together as often as a committee must meet. Now, if your National Committee is to be

anything more than a farce, comrades, you must say to that National Committee, "Choose you the men whom you will make your executive officers," or else what happens? You elect one body, the National Committee, by a referendum vote, and then you ask for a referendum vote of the party again on the question of an executive committee. What do we find? We find that under the rule of democracy, so called—it is not democracy but its perversion mobocracy—we find that under that mobocracy which takes the place of democracy in the minds of some of our party membership, we have Colonel Dick Maples nominated for the highest position in our party and polling a thousand votes when he is not even a member of the party.

Comrades, where are you going? Here we have right in our own state of New York men nominated, mainly by people living far away from New York, who have simply been misled by the glamor of a name or newspaper talk; and then men out of touch with the party life, out of touch with its spirit, are elected to carry on the work of the party over and above the men who have been chosen on the National Committee.

If you want a political party I ask you to set efficiency above mobocracy; if you want a political party I ask you to set organization above anarchy, common sense above demagogism.

DEL GOEBEL (Pa.): I want to be perfectly frank in this matter. I would sooner see the Socialist Party go to destruction through the mistakes of its membership than be saved by the leadership of some Moses. In the second place, I want you to state facts and not simply finespun theories. We used to have a method of electing the executive committee which resulted as indicated by Comrade Spargo. But we changed it by a referendum vote of the membership the country over. Why did we change it? There must have been a reason. We knew the reason. You know the reason. In the last two years, under this new method of electing the Executive Committee with the rank and file voting for them, what did we have? We are told that we can't do business if we are required to vote. Can anyone tell me in the history of the party where the party has made

more progress than during the last two years with the National Executive Committee elected by the rank and file? Not only that. We have had something else, a greater thing, the assurance that we do not need a lot of self-appointed Mosesses. What else happened? The old method is absolutely unfair. I have recently come from New England. New Hampshire, in my honest judgment, has not sixty members paying dues, but it elects a member of the National Committee. That National Committee man has as much power in determining and shaping the policy of the party as one who comes from New York with 2,000 members. Is that fair, is that honest? Is that democracy? Is that standing for the rank and file? I stand for the rank and file with all its mistakes, even with all the mistakes, for with all their mistakes they come in the long run nearer to doing the right thing than the gentlemen who tell us we must be saved from ourselves. Don't forget the two years' of progress under the National Executive Committee elected by the rank and file who don't know how to do things.

DEL BERLYN (Ill.): I want democracy. And I also want to protest against these insinuations against the Committee on Constitution, which are called officialdom. Not one of them is in the pay of the Socialist Party,—of the National party,—not one. I have been elected by the delegates at this convention on the Constitution Committee. To that committee I have brought such knowledge and experience that I have, to my regret, lost the union of the membership that I come in contact with, and tried, as nearly as I could, to get that into the party constitution. It is delightful of Comrade Goebel to make the comparison between the National Committeeman of New Hampshire and the National Committeeman from New York by two thousand, or a portion of two thousand, because I believe they have four members that do the same Comrade Goebel wants some important functions of the party to be put in the hands of the National organizers, who are only appointees. Now, don't you forget that. That is favoring democracy! When it

is me, why then it goes; when it isn't, then it doesn't go.

Democracy is something like India rubber. You can stretch it any way you like. I have got a taste of your referendum business right in my cigar workers' union. Socialism has obtained a victory about fourteen years ago, and we have established everything by the referendum. Yet, they robbed us of our convention, and after a referendum they established an oligarchy that it would take the force of a revolution to abolish, and that was the end of the name of democracy. You are very inconsistent in this matter. You want a National Executive Committee and you want a National Committee. If you don't want a National Committee, abolish it, but if you must have a National Committee, let them have the name of the National Executive Committee, and then if we are dissatisfied with the work of the National Committee selected by the various states, you won't by a referendum vote; if we should be dissatisfied with the work of the National Executive Committee, and receive protest from the membership against certain actions of the National Executive Committee, and we wanted to get busy, we wanted to respond to this sense of democracy, to respond to our constituents who have elected the National Committee, then the National Executive Committee is provided for the National referendum, and their time of office would be expired before we could set in motion the machinery to remove them. If the National Committee had control, which they ought to have—I don't want to be on it any more; I don't want to be on the National Executive Committee, but I have been there through the referendum vote of my constituency, but if the National Committee is to have control, you must put it in the hands of the National Committee, and then if there is any general dissatisfaction among the members in the various states, they can set the machinery in motion to compel the National Committee to take such action as would respond to their wishes.

Your ideal of democracy is all right where perfect discussion can take place, and where the questions can all be thrashed out, where the people can come together as they do in Switzerland, with their umbrellas, and vote on any question they want to. But you can't

have a referendum in the United States and call all the people together from all parts of the country and have one big mass meeting and settle it. For heaven's sake, act in the line of common sense and reason; keep democracy at the bottom as the basis, but keep the organization acting efficiently, and let each organ of the body respond to the action of all the others. That is the only way you will get efficiency.

COMRADE GAYLORD: I wish to read for the information of some of the delegates from Article IV.

Section 1. Each organized state or territory shall be represented on the National Committee by one member, and by an additional member for every two thousand members or major fraction thereof in good standing in the party.

I also want to read to you the last clause of Section 2:

"The members of the National Committee shall be subject to removal by referendum vote of their respective States."

The members of your constitution committee have been accused of having intellect, and we have been guilty to the charge. I just want you to listen a moment. We believe in democracy, but we do not believe in democracy as a fetch. Democracy has been applied in this convention to some extent, and even sometimes I have seen votes carried with a whoop and a hurrah without even properly knowing what they were voting about. I see some who applaud vigorously whenever democracy and the referendum are mentioned, who in private conversation with me, have played upon the phrase, "The masses," and pummed upon it, spelling it with the "m" removed from the last word and attached to the first word—you can make your own pronunciation. I was a little astonished. It is in this way that we learn who are the people who do believe in democracy. I believe in democracy and efficiency. In discussing the wording of the constitution in committee, we conceived that the National Committee is the hand of the party membership, it is the hand with which the party does its business. We also conceived that the National Committee cannot very well transact the minute details of the National office, the attending to the bookkeeping, buying stationery, putting the National

Secretary under bond, and seeing that it is done. We conceive that the National Committee must have a hand also to attend to these things. Some things may be done by correspondence. But the National Committee must have a hand, and that hand must be the Executive Committee. You will find as we go farther that we provided a hand, if you please, for the National Executive Committee, in the National Secretary. Further, we give him authority to secure his own assistants in his office. This is logical. If all goes together, and is one piece. It is not contradictory at any point, and back of it all you have quicker control over the National Secretary or his clerks through the recall of your National Committeeman, than you have by a National referendum.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved. All those in favor of the motion that the main question be now put, say "aye." Those opposed, "no." The "ayes" have it, and the previous question is ordered.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): What we want to do is to get down to business, and not go back to Dick Maples. If we had been conducting referendums in this party and been doing it constantly, and had enough of them the party membership would have found out that Col. Dick Maples was not a member of the Socialist Party. And the fact that we were not doing it, left us entirely ignorant of whether Colonel Maples was a member of the party. But bear in mind that a majority of the voters found out readily that Dick Maples was not a member, and we have a way of keeping a man from taking a position even if he is elected, so there is no danger of Dick Maples getting control of the party, even though the rank and file do not know who are their members. There is a way of heading them off, and hence there is no danger on that score.

The position taken by Comrade Snyder was not that he could ultimately overthrow the wishes of the people of Kansas, but his rank and file could do it in a way that their purpose would be thwarted to a great extent before they would find out what he had done, and that he could for the time

throw the state into confusion. Yet they would find it out in the long run, but they would not do it quick enough to prevent the confusion.

This all comes down from one question. It means that if the National Committee elects the National Executive Committee and thereby deprives the rank and file of the control of the National Executive Committee, the result must be that you have delegated all your power to the National Committee, because if the people who compose the rank and file of the National movement are not allowed to choose the National Executive Committee, it is evident that you have delegated your power to the National Committee, and they in turn, have used that power in a way that is not in harmony with the real principles of the referendum of the Socialist Party. It makes no difference who you elect, or how you do the voting. I am one of the fellows that believe that the rank and file of the Socialist Party of the United States will not go wrong ultimately. They may do it occasionally, as in the case of Dick Maples, but ultimately they will not do wrong, but when we delegate the power to a certain small body of men, they may do the wrong thing. For the sake of democracy, I say leave it to the rank and file.

Democracy has been laughed at here. I regret to say that that term has been laughed at by men who stood on this floor. But the term "democracy" means a great deal to the rank and file of the Socialist Party, and these people who have criticised this term are not the friends of democracy, that is dear to the hearts of the men who make up the Socialist Party of the United States.

Keep down this idea of concentration and the future of the Socialist Party is safe.

Comrades, do you agree with the men who believe in business, who believe in expediting matters, who believe that those at the head of this organization know more how to run the affairs of the Socialist Party than the working-class rank and file? I tell you that the man who says that thinks that those who compose the National Executive Committee know how to run the affairs of the party better than the rank and file. I would rather risk the affairs of the party in the hands of the wooden shoe common farmer on Spiny creek,



than the individual who makes that assertion.

Turn this down, for Heaven's sake! Don't delegate your powers to the head of the organization, but keep it up down with the wooden shoe men, if you please.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is now upon the adoption of the minority report.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): The motion is on the adoption of the minority report, which is to strike out the words "National Committee" and substitute the words "referendum vote," and the sense of it is that the National Executive Committee shall be elected by a referendum vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Cries of "division," "division."

THE CHAIRMAN: As many of you as are in favor of the adoption of this minority report will raise their right hands.

DEL. CLARK: Remember you are voting for the people.

DEL. GOEBEL: Let us have a roll call and put them on record on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: The convention is to adjourn at 6 o'clock, but the delegates desires a twenty-minute roll call.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): A point of order. The roll call cannot be demanded at any moment.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I move that the roll call be taken.

The motion was seconded, and carried.

The Secretary then called the roll as follows:

Yes:—ARK, Hogan, LeFevre, Snow; ARIZ., Cannon, Morrison; CAL., Cole, Starkweather; COLO., Maynard, Buie, Platoon, Miller; DEL., Henck, G.A., Wilke; IDAHO, Penhew, Egg; ILL., Hunt, Knopfner, Carr; IOWA, Work, Hills; KAN., Snyder, Brewer, Katterfeld; KY., Seeds; LA., Hymes; MICH., Stirtin; MINN., Nieminen; MO., Callery; MONT., Westleder, Peura; NEB., Porter; NEV., Miller; N. J., Goebel, Strobel; N. Y., Lewis, Fieldman, Furman, Klenke; N. C., Quantz; OHIO, Ziegler, Devine; OKLA., Branstetter (O. F.), Ross, Dose, Block, O'Hare; PA., Young; R. I., Hurst; TENN., Vose; TEXAS, McFadin, Bell, Payne, Clark, Buchanan, Rhodes, Thompson; UTAH, Leggett; VT., Wilson; V.A., Dennett; WASH., Hendrickson, Boomer; WIS., Thomas,

Melms, Berger, Thompson, Tuttle, Sanjurjo, Jacobs; WYO., Grosbeck. No:—ALA., Waldhorst; CAL., Bradford, McDevitt, Wheat, Woodby, Tuck, Merrill, Osborne, Johns, McKee, Bauer; CONN., Smith; FLA., Pettigrew; ILL., Collins, Bentall, Berlyn, Kerr, May W. Simons, A. M. Simons, Smith, Kornagold; IND., Dunbar, Kothari; IOWA, Roberts, Brown; ME., Peiser; MASS., Kenikow; ELIOT White, D'Orsay; MINN., Peach, Kaplan, Thorsett, Ingalls, Williams, Anderson; MO., Hoch, Brandt, Pope; MONT., Graham, Hazlett, Ambrose, Harvey, Powers; N. J., Kearns, Kraft, Reilly; N. Y., Solomon, Wanhope, Lee, Siodon, Paulsch, Gerber, Spargo, Strebel, Fuhrman; OHIO, Prevey, Cowan, Bandlow, Vautrin, Jones, Farrell, Hayes; OKLA., Hagel, Davis, Boylan, Wills; ORE., Barzee, Ramp; PA., Adams, Clark, Davies; UTAH, Syphers; WASH., Herman, Wagenknecht, Krueger, Dowdy, Martin; V.A., Houston; WIS., Gaylord, Weber, Heath; WYO., O'Neill.

Absent:—ALA., Freeman; ARK., Perrin, Penrose, Jones; CONN., Scheldige; IDAHO, Untermann; ILL., Brower, Fraenckel, Morgan, Stedman, Walker; IND., Strickland, Adams; IOWA, Shanley, KAN., Wilson, McAlister; MD., Toole, Lewis; MASS., Carey, Hitchcock, Dan White, Mahoney, Putney, Cutting, Fenton; MICH., Lockwood, Menton, Hittunen; MINN., Rose, Maatta, Macki; MO., Garber, Behrens, Lipscomb; N. H., Wilkins, Armistead; N. J., Killingslee, N. M., Metcalf; N. Y., Hillquit, Hunter, Hanford, Vander Porten, Peiser, Cole; N. D., Bassett, Anderson; OKLA., Winnie E. Branstetter, Edwards, Reynolds; ORE., Varner, Ryan, Crabtree; PENN., J. E. Cohen; G. N. Cohen, Foley, Moore, Maurer, Rieger, Slavator, Schwartz; S. D., Atwood, Knowles; TEXAS, Holman, Smith; WASH., Brown.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I wish to change my vote from yes to no.

The Secretary then announced the vote as cast to be 66 "yes" and 83 "no."

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair declares the motion to substitute is lost.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I desire to have it put on record that 66 of the delegates are already out of the Convention, that is, one-third of the membership gone.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now is upon the motion that we adopt

the Committee's report on this section. All those who favor the Committee's report will say "aye," those opposed "no." The "ayes" have it, and it is carried. The report of the committee is adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is another minority report which you will find in the printed copy of the Constitution, and in all fairness to Comrade Bell, who spent considerable time in working it out, it should be considered. It is a method of preferential voting. You have it there and you understand what it is. I will not read it unless the Convention calls for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the majority on that section has been adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: Article VI, Section 2.

#### "DUTIES OF NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE."

"Section 2. The duties of the National Executive Committee shall be to supervise and direct the work of the National Secretary; to organize unorganized states and territories; to receive and pass upon the reports of the National Secretary, and to transact all current business of the National office, except such as is by this constitution expressly reserved for the National Committee, or the general vote of the party. The National Executive Committee shall also formulate the rules and order of business of the National Convention of the party not otherwise provided for by this constitution, subject to adoption or amendment by the conventions."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? The section is adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 3.

"Section 3. The Executive Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with this constitution or with the rules of the National Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted. There is no objection, and it is so ordered.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 4.

"Section 4. The Executive Committee shall transmit copies of the minutes of its meetings to all members of the National Convention, and all its acts and resolutions shall be subject to

the revision of the National Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted. It is so ordered.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 5.

"Section 5. The National Executive Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so. Between sessions all its business shall be transacted by correspondence."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted. There is no objection and it is so ordered.

DEL. BELL (Tex.): Will my proposed method go into the record?

DEL. GAYLORD: It goes in as part of the minority report.

The Bell minority report was as follows:

To strike out from Section 1, Article VI, third line, the words "National Committee" and substitute "referendum vote."

To strike out from Section 1, Article VI, the last sentence and substitute the following:

The names of candidates shall be placed on the ballot in alphabetical arrangement.

The member voting shall designate his first choice by writing the figure "1" opposite the name of his first choice; his second choice by writing the figure "2" opposite the name of his second choice; his third choice by writing the figure "3" opposite the name of his third choice, indicating his relative preference for each and every candidate named upon the ballot by different and consecutive numbers. Any ballot not made in exact compliance with the aforesaid rules shall be void.

The several National Executive Committees shall be indicated by different numbers, and the member placing in nomination a candidate shall indicate by number for which of the specific offices the nomination is made.

Ballotting for each National Executive Committeeman shall be done as if they were different and indicated by different numbers.

The candidate indicated by the lower sum total of numbers opposite his name upon the ballot shall be elected.

Vacancies shall be filled in similar manner.

Members of the National Committee may be recalled on referendum vote.

The initiative for recall shall not be

held open but shall be sent out immediately.

DEL. GAYLORD: The next section is Article VII, which reads as follows:

Section 1: The National Secretary shall be elected by the National Committee, and shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and election shall be conducted at the same time and in the same manner as that of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in a similar manner. The National Secretary shall receive as compensation the sum of Fifteen Hundred Dollars annually, and shall give a bond in a sum fixed by the National Executive Committee."

There is a substitute offered by the minority, Comrades Snyder, Lipscomb and Bell, as follows:

"The National Secretary shall be elected or recalled in the same manner as are the National Executive Committee members, and vacancies filled in the same manner."

DEL. STARKWEATHER (Cal.): I move to amend by adding the words: "The Secretary shall be subject to recall by national referendum."

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): The National Secretary is always subject to recall. You can always recall a National Committeeman by referendum, because a certain number can always call for a referendum vote on any party matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will rule unless it is otherwise insisted upon that this clause also falls with the action on the report on the other section.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I want to offer a substitute for the report of the majority, that the National Secretary shall be elected by a referendum vote of the party membership, the nominations and election to be held as under the present constitution.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The subject before the house is the Article of the Constitution just read. Comrade Goebel has the floor.

DEL. GOEBEL: I have no desire to take your time, but even if I am the only man who votes that way, I shall vote against this majority report.

I know of no finer scheme for building up a machine in the Socialist Party than we have here today, whatever may be the motives of the committee. One of

the things that you and I have pointed out on the platform is that under the capitalist rule you have a chance only once every two years to elect your governors and state officers, and legislators. What have we here? There are two radical changes. The membership is to have no voice directly in the election of the National Secretary, and then not satisfied with that, they propose that we shall have him appointed for two years instead of one. I protest against it. Just what we have had in the past we are to have again. I am a long time in this movement, and I know some of the history of the Socialist Labor Party, and I know what they ran up against from this same kind of organization, this closely centralized plan of organization. What puzzles me is that with all that history in your recollection you still vote for such articles as this. I tell you that I am going to vote to have the rank and file elect this National Secretary, and not twenty or thirty or even forty men.

A DELEGATE: I would like to know if the members of the National Committee were not always elected by referendum vote.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: They were always elected by referendum vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the motion by the delegate from New Jersey. Those in favor will raise their hands and remain so till counted. Those opposed will do likewise.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I desire to be recorded as voting for this resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is in favor of the motion 55; opposed 62. The motion is lost.

DEL. RIGG (Idaho): I move that when this is submitted to referendum vote the substitute be submitted with it, and the matter will then be tested.

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was duly seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion was made by Comrade Rigg that the substitute and the committee's report be printed and sent to the referendum as an alternative. The motion was made and seconded to lay that motion on the table. A division is called for.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I should like to ask whether it is not true that

all of this constitution by its provisions must go to the referendum.

DELEGATES: Sure!

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the motion to lay on the table will raise their hands. Those opposed. The chair will say that when the constitution is sent to referendum each member will have the opportunity to compare it with the present constitution, and they will compare it before they vote.

The motion to lay on the table was declared carried by a vote of 61 for and 52 against.

A DELEGATE: A point of information. If any part of this proposed constitution is defeated on the referendum would the old constitution stand?

DELEGATES: Sure. Certainly. It was decided that a defeated amendment could not be submitted to referendum.

Adjourned until 9 a. m., May 17.

## EIGHTH DAY'S SESSION

According to the adjournment the previous day the convention was to have met at 9 o'clock, but it was considerably later when Del. Gaylord called the convention to order and called for nominations for Chairman of the day.

Del. Thompson, of Wisconsin, was elected Chairman for the day.

National Secretary Barnes was by common consent declared elected temporary Secretary in the absence of Secretary Heath.

## FRATERNAL DELEGATES FROM CANADA.

The fraternal delegates from Canada were offered the floor.

DEL. A. W. MANCE (fraternal delegate from Canada): Comrades and friends, a good many of you know that I was from Canada originally, and after I got through with my work here in Chicago on the Weekly Socialist, I went home for a while to see my mother, and she treated me so well that I have been there ever since. When I got to Toronto I thought I would not look at a Socialist or see one for at least a couple of months, because I wanted rest. I thought I wanted to get away from them. But I got there Wednesday, and on Saturday night I was on the corner talking Socialism in Toronto (Applause), and I got just as busy there as I was here. So it is the same spirit that dominates a man, no matter what part of the world he gets in.

If you imagine, any of you, that you can get away from Socialism, you will have to travel farther into the woods than I have. I have traveled through Canada, and I have been away up in the North. Our movement there is very similar to what it is here. Conditions there are very similar to what they are here, except we are having or did have until last fall a particularly active land movement. The last of the great West is now being opened up in western Canada. What was known as the American

frontier for more than a hundred years and had been rolling west has now started to roll north, and there is a great, tremendous territory opening up. But I am glad to tell you that within a week after the first settler goes anywhere in a new community there is some kind of a Socialist document reaches him. I have been away up where the last settler appeared to be in the northern country, and there I would either find the Appeal to Reason or Wildfire's Magazine or some other Socialist paper or pamphlet. (Applause.) The conditions there are very similar to what they are here. It is only an imaginary line that divides us. We speak the same language, we wear the same kind of clothes, and we know no difference between the laws of capitalism there and here. There is merely a difference in name so far as the governments are concerned.

While you have been watching parades of the unemployed of the United States in your cities, we in Toronto also had an unemployed problem, and I wish to tell you that when the unemployed, who numbered hundreds, thousands, yes, probably ten thousand, needed some one to speak for them the only ones who would hire a hall and lead them down and talk to the authorities were the Socialists of local of Toronto. (Applause.)

We paid the hall rent for three days, talked Socialism to them, and then we took them down to the city hall and told the mayor the condition the people were in, and made speeches from the city hall steps. The council authorities there have a little more sense than they have here. We sent them word that we were coming and that we would be down there perhaps a thousand strong at a certain time on a certain morning. They did not get the police force to mob us or do anything else. We gathered in front of the city hall two thousand strong. We arranged to have our

marshals march them down straight, almost like an army, and from the time we left the meeting hall until we got to the city hall steps was the first time we saw a policeman anywhere. Then they told us to spread out, that the mayor was ready to receive us. There were whole portions of the city of Toronto that had to be fed by charity, just the same as you have here. Despite the fact that we have millions of acres of land and factories that can more than supply everything that the desire of a human being can ask for, there is poverty there the same as here.

The immigration problem is just beginning to reach them, and there is where our Socialist philosophy is running up against practical facts and coming into clash there the same as they do here. There is an attempt in British Columbia on the part of the white race to keep the Japanese from overcoming them. As you know, we are building about 12,000 miles of new railroads through that country in the western and southwestern provinces. In British Columbia there are about 125,000 white men, and had the business men succeeded in the attempt to bring the cookies and Japs in there they would simply have had a rebellion on their hands in the British Empire to keep them out. Those are the facts. I am not here to discuss the fine points in our philosophy, but there are the facts, and I am satisfied that that is one of the great problems that will bring the working class of Canada in the West to lead, and those in the United States to imitate.

Now, I believe in the Socialist philosophy, which says, "Workers of all countries, unite," but there is the fact, and inside of five years the white race in the western provinces of Canada will absolutely have a struggle to keep the Japanese and Chinese from overrunning the field. The problem there is just the same as here, exactly.

Just one more point about our movement over there. It is young, healthy and strong. It is revolutionary, what there is of it. We have a large number of dues-paying members in Toronto. We have five locals of different languages, Finnish, Jewish, English, French and Italian. We have over 400 of our Finnish comrades there, and they are the same as they are everywhere. In a population of 400 Finns there are 120 dues-paying Finnish comrades, and they

have built a hall of their own that cost them \$12,000. They have got a band and a little theater and almost everything you could desire, and they are just like their people everywhere, ready for Socialism, waiting for the rest of the workingmen to get ready. (Applause.)

In British Columbia our comrades have succeeded in sending three members to the legislature, and our comrades from the West will bear me out that they are capable of holding up the banner of Socialism and the red flag of liberty in that legislature. Although they call themselves impossibilists, they are the kind of impossibilists that I like, although I do not generally come under that head. (Applause.) They watch everything that comes up, and they are looking after the interests of the working class.

Our movement there is healthy, strong and revolutionary. It is just what a young movement ought to be, with a membership who really understand the principles of Socialism, and we will yet see the time when the movement over there will probably grow as fast as anywhere else in the world. It appears that we have got economic conditions alike, just about the same the world over. Immigrants are rolling in, last year 300,000 of them.

With one incident I will close. We have got about 30,000 immigrants in Toronto alone. They had a big preachers' meeting the other day in Toronto, and a very famous preacher there, a doctor, made a very impassioned speech on the immigration question. He showed that at that rate the immigrants were arriving it was only a question of time until they would swamp the English population, because when you take into account that two millions of them are French in the province of Quebec and that they are in about the same condition now that they were two hundred years ago in France when their ancestors immigrated out there, they naturally got frightened. He said that every tenth man, I think it was, or fifteenth man, that you meet today is an immigrant in the city of Toronto; every twentieth man that you meet in the Dominion of Canada is an immigrant. They came last year in great numbers, and there was a tremendous problem, and Dr. Wilson held up his hands in holy horror of the future. A few weeks afterward in the hall which the city

council owns and gave us free of rent to hold our May Day celebration we had 1,200 of these people gathered in that hall. There were the Italians, the Poles, the Jews, the Irish, and people of almost all nationalities. I stood before that audience that night to make an address for the international Socialist Party, and I referred to Dr. Wilson's address and his fear and horror of these foreigners, and I said, "Doctor, don't worry; as I look out over this audience I see a proof of one of the grand principles of Socialism, the brotherhood of man. Doctor, we will take care of them." (Applause.)

DEL. J. E. DRURY (fraternal delegate from Canada): I have just come over here to present greetings to you from Canada. The fact is that no matter where you go you always meet Socialists. We have just come over here to see how you run your business here and to see if we can learn anything. Possibly we can learn a little, if we cannot learn much. I think we are certainly helping the American Socialist movement, and maybe after the next election we will return one or two of our members from Ontario to the legislature. (Applause.)

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION RESUMED.

THE CHAIRMAN: The business pending is Article VII, Section 1.

DEL. GAYLORD: This article has been fully discussed, and it only remains for the convention to say whether or not it will adopt the report of the committee on this section:

"Section 1. The National Secretary shall be elected by the National Committee and shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and election shall be conducted at the same time and in the same manner as that of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner. The National Secretary shall receive as compensation the sum of fifteen hundred dollars annually and shall give a bond in a sum fixed by the National Executive Committee."

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal): I would like to make an amendment. The amendment offered is where it says that the National Secretary shall hold

office for two years. I would make an amendment this way: "Shall be elected by the National Committee and hold office at the will of the National Committee" instead of two years. (Seconded.)

DEL. FIELDMAN: If you want to kill a majority report, or rather the report of the committee, you cannot kill it any more effectively than by just placing in it this expression "at will." I do not say that Comrade Osborne intended it so, but if he did he could not devise a better method of having this thing killed, for the constitution of the Socialist party will never stand for the election of any officer to hold office at the will of any committee, that is to say, to hold it just as long as that committee sees fit. (Applause.) I therefore hope, comrades, that you will understand, if you see the purpose, the reason for this, and that you will vote it down. Let the National Committee be commanded by the Socialist Party of this country; that the National Secretary be elected for two years, and after that two years we will elect either the same one or a new National Secretary. That is the sensible thing, and that is consequently the proper thing to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

(Question called for.) All those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The yeos have it; the amendment is defeated. Proceed.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): Let us pass the article.

The article as reported was again read, and on motion was adopted.

Delegates Devine, of Ohio, and Storton, of Michigan, asked to be recorded as favoring the election of National Secretary, by referendum vote of the membership.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): A point of information. The section just adopted provided that a bond be given by the Secretary. I would like to ask the Committee on Constitution if they have considered who is to hold that bond.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the committee answer?

DEL. MORGAN: Who is to hold that bond? Who could sue on that bond if the Secretary violated any of his financial obligations? There are a lot of lawyers here. I want to find out what provision has been made to secure the funds of the party, whether they are

secure now, or whether they will be secured by the giving of that bond.

DEL. GAYLORD: I will ask Comrade Slobodin to answer.

DEL. SLOBODIN: The committee does not believe that the party can sue on the bond. Naturally it will be the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party most likely. If there are trustees, then the bond is to go to the trustees, and they will be the ones to sue, or whoever the National Committee may determine.

DEL. MORGAN: I want to know if the committee has considered the fact that under the constitution as it now stands it now gives no protection absolutely to the funds of the party, and if Comrade Barnes should die today his heirs would have absolute control of every dollar that is in his possession, and there is nobody in the party, under the present constitution, to take that constitution, that has a right to sue for any piece of property that is held by the party. I simply ask for information. I ask the committee, before it finishes its report, to frame a section to go with that, or if you can tell us how we are satisfied that every dollar paid in by the members is secured by the proper officer under that constitution.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): We never had in the constitution a clause for a bond. Now, I suggest that we have a clause providing for a bond. The reason is this. In the report of the Executive Committee I notice a statement as to the manner of the disposal of the money. It was decided by the Executive Committee that the National Secretary deposit the funds in the name of the Socialist party. Now there is established some control.

We have a constitution with every point involved. We are generous, but experience should teach us wisdom. I have got perfect faith in Comrade Barnes, but it is the possibility that I want to protect the party against, and I believe that the Executive Committee or those who we trust with the management of the property will create such safeguards as are necessary and as experience teaches us from time to time. We are wasting time. We ought to get through by dinner time and go home.

DEL. GAYLORD: Let me suggest that Comrade Morgan frame this at this time, as we are out of order technically and if he will frame his conception of

how it should be drafted, whether it should embody a provision specifically providing for the details, we can introduce this under a motion to adopt as a whole, when it will be perfectly in order and get it as Comrade Morgan wants it.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection that suggestion will be accepted and we will proceed.

The remaining sections of Article VII, Sections 2, 3 and 4, were then read, with the explanation that they were identical with those in the old constitution. The sections are as follows:

"Section 2. The National Secretary shall have charge of all affairs of the National office subject to the directions of the Executive Committee and the National Committee. He shall receive the reports of the state organizations and of the local organizations in unorganized states and territories. He shall supervise the accounts of the national office, and the work of the lecture bureau, the literature bureau, and such other departments as may hereafter be established in connection with the National office."

"Section 3. The National Secretary shall issue to all party organizations, in such way as the Executive Committee may direct, monthly bulletins containing a report of the financial affairs of the party, a summary of the conditions and the membership of the several state and territorial organizations, the prices of the business transacted by his office and such other matters pertaining to the organization and activity of the party as may be of general interest to the membership. Such bulletins shall not contain editorial comment."

"Section 4. The National Secretary shall be empowered to secure such help as may be necessary for the proper transaction of the business of his office."

The three sections were adopted without objection or discussion.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I want to move an additional section, to be known as Section 5.

"Section 5. The National Secretary may be recalled at any time by the National Committee or the membership."

The amendment was seconded and adopted without discussion.

DEL. GAYLORD: In Article VIII the committee makes only one sugges-

tion for a change in Section 2. It read formerly: "The lecture bureau shall have no connection with the work of organization, and it shall have the right to make arrangements for the lecturers under its auspices with all state or local organizations of the party." We make this suggestion: Strike out the phrase "shall have no connection with the work of organization." That seemed to us to be nonsensical, because the work of the lecture bureau almost unavoidably has connection with the work of organization in new fields, and we want it to be so. On the other hand, we strike out the phrase "shall have the right to make arrangements with all local organizations," and make it "shall have the right to make arrangements with all state organizations." That means this, that if the National Secretary makes arrangements through the state organizations to route speakers through the local organizations it is satisfactory and according to the constitution, but where the state secretaries prefer that such routing be through the state office entirely, then the constitution can permit it to be done in that manner. It removes the possibility of friction and misunderstanding. Now, in the first section there is no change as to the lecture bureau.

The first section is as follows:

"Section 1. There shall be maintained in connection with the National office a lecture bureau for the purpose of arranging tours for lecturers for the propaganda of Socialism."

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the suggestion of the committee.

On motion the section was adopted without discussion.

The next section was read.

"Section 2. The lecture bureau shall have the right to make arrangements for the lecturers under its auspices with all state organizations of the party."

Adopted without objection.

The next section was read.

"Section 3. The National Committee shall establish a uniform rate of compensation for all lecturers and organizers working under its auspices." Adopted without debate.

Article IX was read.

"Section 1. The National Committee shall also maintain in the headquarters of the party a department for

the dissemination of Socialist literature."

"Section 2. The Literature Bureau shall keep for sale to the local organizations of the party and others, a stock of Socialist books, pamphlets and other literature, and shall have the right, with the approval of the committee, to publish works on Socialism or for the purpose of Socialist propaganda, but this clause shall not be construed as authorizing the bureau to publish any periodical."

"Section 3. The profits of the Literature Bureau shall go into the general funds of the party treasury."

The article was adopted without objection.

DEL. GAYLORD: To facilitate discussion, and I know discussion will arise, I wish to say that the first sentence in Article X, is the same as the former Section 1 of "Conventions," and I will read it.

"Section 1. The regular National Convention of the party shall be held in all years in which elections for President and Vice President of the United States are to be held."

There is no question on that, I believe.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections? It is adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: As to the second sentence under "Conventions," for the purpose of facilitating the discussion, not having had a chance to confer with the committee and learn the opinion of the committee, I wish to make this a separate section.

"Section 2. A convention composed of National Committee, State Secretaries of various states and editors of Socialist newspapers designated by the National Committee shall be held in all even numbered years when no regular convention is held, to consider and report recommendations upon the program, agitation and organization of the party."

I wish to say that I have added there what was definitely understood in the committee, but did not get into print. A question has been raised, but Del. Slayton will confirm me when I say that it was definitely understood in the committee that this was to be considered and report recommendations upon program, agitation and organization of the party. May I speak just a moment on

that? I move the adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this section be adopted. The comrade has asked for the floor.

DEL. GAYLORD: I think I can save time. I know you want to make amendments, and I want to open the door for them. We did not have time in the convention for proper consideration. One of the most important things that the organization has done was when it was moved here to put this over till 9 o'clock in the morning, and we do not know that we can do anything for four years unless we adopt this. There are important things that come up. We have not had a chance to get together and properly develop our ideas of agitation and organization. We need this opportunity. Now, how shall we secure this opportunity in the simplest way? I am not absolutely sure it is the best way, but we have wanted something, and we formulated it this way. If you can find a better way, very well, but we felt the necessity of that, and the happenings in this convention have proved it.

DEL. SLAYTON: I want to suggest to Comrade Gaylord a point that other speakers may take into consideration. You say to us to consider, recommend, or consider and adopt. What do they want to recommend? To whom will they recommend? To the National Committee. Therefore, instead of recommending I move that it be to adopt measures. I move that as an amendment.

DEL. SPARGO: There is one phrase in the clause as read as to this extra convention, this new form of convention, to which I take very decided objection. This committee has, I see, provided that this convention shall consist of National Committee, National Executive Committee, State Secretaries and editors of papers designated by the National Committee. In that sentence I think we are laying up a store of trouble for the party if we adopt it, unless we make it that any editor of a Socialist paper can attend and take part, or leave it to a vote of the membership. If we place on the National Committee the responsibility of saying that only certain papers shall be represented, then there will inevitably arise, as I can see, jealousy between

papers, and the papers not represented will want to carry on a fight, and it seems to me we could not devise a better plan to create friction than by just that thing, and I move as an amendment that those words "and editors of party papers designated by the National Committee" be stricken out. (Seconded.)

DEL. HAZLETT (Mont.): I think it is of the utmost importance that the editors of Socialist party papers should attend. Now I do not understand that you shall have those that are owned by the state organization or the city or local or county organization, but that all those papers which are recognized as representing the Socialist party should be represented, and it seems to me that we are never going to put the American party on any correct basis of understanding our position until we fortify the press of the American Socialist party. Our press is a disgrace. We only have a few that are not private papers that are more or less charged with a desire to graft on this movement. We are not building up a local press that will fight the capitalists in our home towns and in different sections of the country. Our money is being paid into certain papers far off. Now, it seems to me if we are ever to have a press representing us in our local fights with the capitalist class we have got to have a united party press. It seems to me in this conference I cannot see how it would in any way dispute if all the editors or representatives of all the party papers were asked to come to this conference. I should not be in favor of having only certain ones have the right to represent the Socialist party, but I would like to have all the editors of the party papers. There isn't any paper I know of except the party paper in Montana, the Montana News, and the Social Democratic Herald, that are representative organs of the party. It is of the utmost importance to have good financial and moral support for the papers. The papers that go all over the country and take part in every Socialist conference, you don't have to go to their financial support. So I would wish to have included with the editors of the party press the business managers also.

DEL. L. BURMAN (N. Y.): I would like to ask if these editors will have only a voice and no vote, or whether they will have a voice and vote with the committee.

DEL. MAY WOOD SIMONS (Ill.): I understand this proposition is to the effect that the results of the meeting or conference or convention shall go out to the party for a referendum. I simply want to make an amendment. Is the motion or the amendment now before this house?

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is now before us, made by Comrade Spargo.

DEL. MAY WOOD SIMONS: Then I wish to amend this in this form: that the editors of the papers and the business managers shall be included in the conferences, without a vote, but that they shall have the right to take part in the conferences. It seems to me this is absolutely essential. No one needs educating any more than the editors of our papers (laughter and applause), and it is absolutely necessary that we should come in close contact with the organizers and with those who are mentioned in this to take part in the conference. Therefore, I believe this form would be entirely satisfactory to the party if they are given the benefit of the discussion, but are not allowed to vote. We understand that these editors are not elected by the party, that is, the majority of them are not. Therefore, they should not have a vote in the conference, because the matter is to go out before the party in a referendum. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I agree with Comrade Simons that there is no one who needs education more than the editor. Not only that, but the editor is the one most apt to learn, as a rule. If he does not learn he will soon cease to be an editor. I can say this from experience; I have had many years experience in editing papers, both dailies and weeklies, and I can say this from experience that I have had in editing a daily that went down and editing weeklies also that came near being an absolute success in every way, that is even financially, without having a gold mine to back it, than any other Socialist paper in the country. While we have no surplus, we come near paying our running expenses. In other words, I mean the Social Democratic Herald. A year ago it had a monthly deficit of four dollars. That is very little for a Socialist paper, of course. But, of course, that is not the idea. I do not know of

any editor who wants to come here to dictate to anybody. If the editors want to dictate they find other means than to push themselves upon any convention in their capacity as editors. An editor can usually manage to be elected a delegate, let me tell you. I have always heard that. Just look at Comrade Lee; how often has he been a delegate, or Simons, or Berger? Don't you forget it, we could become delegates if we want to. That is not the idea. It is not that Socialist editors would want to push themselves upon any convention as delegates.

As I understand the idea of these conferences, and I have talked the matter over with some of our friends, it is that this is the only country I know of and the only convention of Socialist parties wherein there is so little real theoretical, real scientific theoretical discussion going on. When an editor delegates gets up and talks, what he says and what he thinks is scientific, it is usually repeating the cheap phrases he had learned from some five-cent pamphlet, and that is the beginning and the end of all his phrases. There is a deplorable lack of any good, real discussion from the Socialist scientific standpoint, from the real scientific standpoint in the use of a few phrases about clear-cutness and class consciousness and uncompromisedness and a good deal of nonsense. Not only do they use a few hollow words, but let me tell you that is not science. A man has to be able to talk about any subject, and we do usually to some extent in Milwaukee. We take up anything, whether it is a new pavement, whether it is some other subject that is before us and treat it from a Socialist standpoint.

Now, you can take up any subject; you can take up history and treat it from the Socialist standpoint. I understand these conferences are in off years when we do not have any ticket to nominate and no platform to make a fight about, as to whether these are scientific or not. As I say, they are to be when we have the peace of mind to sit down and take up the questions before the people and treat them in a scientific manner from a theoretical Socialist standpoint, and then you will see that our other conventions will have a higher standard and a higher level. That is what I understand the conference is to be for, and there is where

we need the editors and need them very badly.

A DELEGATE: We must have them.

DEL. BERGER: Now, it is entirely superfluous or really of little consequence whether you have a voice and vote or not. It does not make any difference, because they are not making a new constitution, they are simply to express their opinions on certain subjects before the people. If you don't want me there as editor, then I will be elected the same as the others.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me suggest that we have the amendment offered by Del. Simons before us, and, if you can, dispose of that. I notice they are discussing the main question.

DEL. KONIKOW (Mass.): I would like to know if Comrade Simons' amendment contains the words "designated by the National Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think not.

DEL. GAYLORD: Did you intend to have editors designated by the National Committee, Comrade Simons, or all Socialist editors?

DEL. M. W. SIMONS: All Socialist editors.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will fix it so as to include all Socialist editors.

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): I would like to ask how you are going to designate those Socialist editors.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot answer that question.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I want to ask whether it is the intention of the committee that this conference shall have power to bind the party in any way.

DEL. GAYLORD: The report as changed and approved by the members of the committee gives this conference authority to consider and report recommendations upon program, agitation and organization of the party.

DEL. WORK: And not to bind the party?

DEL. GAYLORD: Not to bind the party. The recommendations would have to go out in the form of a referendum and be adopted before they would bind the party.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I am in favor of this, but I want to move if it is in order at this time, a substitute for the whole, and then I want to give the purpose of it. I move as a substitute the

following: "A convention composed of members elected by referendum vote shall be held in all even numbered years when no regular convention is held, for the purpose of"—and then adding that.

DEL. GAYLORD: Striking out the other?

DEL. POPE: Yes, and if I get a second I will speak to it. (Substitute seconded.) This is my point: You know and I know that there is not an editor in the Socialist movement but what will be sent here on a referendum vote of this party. And what do we want? We want to have the editors, the best minds in our conventions, and we want the conventions held by those who know just what to do. I want the brains of the Socialist Party sent to the conventions if possible, and that is the reason why I moved the substitute.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): Comrade Berger and some people have got a notion that the referendum vote is a garbage barrel for all discarded notions and ideas. Therefore they do not understand those who want to refer to a referendum vote. Now, the constitution provides that the National Committee may meet whenever it deems necessary to do so. It is an expense, but it is a necessity at the same time for the National Committee to meet anyhow. Now you have heard it frequently said that it would be good for the movement if the state secretaries of all the states would meet in a conference. It would be, indeed, but it involves an expense. You have heard it frequently said that it would be well for the movement to have the editors of Socialist papers hold conferences. No question about it, it would be well, but it would involve expense. All these conferences will take place within the next four years, and this obviates the necessity of this sort of an independent conference, and it also will obviate the necessity of calling special conventions; that is, it may obviate the necessity for this sort of a convention. What is the true power, the true influence of this conference, according to the recommendation of the committee? To adopt and recommend, that is all. To recommend does not mean that they have the power to

submit to a referendum. After they recommend what shall be done? The National Committee will submit that by correspondence to see whether the membership will reject or adopt the recommendation. These recommendations will have no more than moral force. At the same time they are valuable for the purpose of education, as far as that is concerned. I say, if we create this convention or create this conference, let us make a success of it. There cannot be so many editors at that time of Socialist newspapers that they will outvote the conference, and I think the editor may be entrusted with a vote. Take the editors of education, and especially the editors of the great Socialist papers in this country, the reason why they are so independent of the party is because they are not represented in the councils of the party. I at one time thought that a certain editor, a well-respected comrade in the West, the editor of a newspaper that you all know here—I thought at one time, but I was mistaken, that he was dangerous to the movement. Now, I think he should be included, even if he once advocated some of the cheap phrases of Hearst. I would admit him to the councils of the party, because I know that if you place every honest man in a responsible position he becomes conservative. By all means let Wayland go to these conferences. By all means let Wilshire have equal powers, and I tell you they will hold themselves more responsible to the party than they do now. That is the reason why I want to have them in the councils of the party. I say by all means let us have them. It is merely a trial, after all. I do not say it will turn out a success. It may make trouble, but let us have a trial of this conference, though it amounts to almost nothing. We may not endorse the recommendations after they are adopted.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): A point of order. Every one that has talked has been talking for one side. Give somebody a chance to say something on the other side. I want to say something on the other side.

DEL. GORBEL (N. J.): I am on the other side because I am not satisfied either with what the committee

has done or with the substitute. If I have any one hobby and have had ever since within one year of my being national organizer, it has been this question of methods, better ways of doing things. I say there is something wrong. I have said it all over the country, and this very proposition continues the wrong. You have got, for example, a number of men on the road as national organizers. You have absolutely no way at present by which you can get the benefit of those men's experience, by which those men can be brought in touch with other workers in the movement and teach the others what has been taught to them. It is only in this way that able men come to be recognized and put in the place they are fitted for. If I had my way we would not call this a convention, because the moment you call it a convention you mix it up. I would call it a national conference. I would have certain people elected and sent to that conference whose expenses would be paid, and who would not have only a voice but a vote in that conference. I would also allow anybody that wanted to come to that conference to come and have a voice but not a vote, and pay their own expenses. The result would be what? We would gather together, in my judgment, the ablest men we have got in any line. I say that today the crying need of the Socialist party is better methods of work. We have, for example, I think I may freely say, no money. Time and time again I have said it, that it is not a question of money; it is a question of methods and I will prove it to you, just as other organizers have said. Now, it is simply a question of getting these people together. If I had my way we would call it a conference and not a convention. We would provide to have sent to the conference at the expense of the national organization the National Committee-men, secretaries and the editors of papers, but no one else to have expenses paid. The national organizers, I would include them. It may seem personal, but I would include them, because they are the men that are coming in touch with the movement and know not only the conditions in the big cities, but in the little cities,

and the difficulties that the outlying local is up against as well as the big city local. I would bring these men together and pay their expenses, and have a regular set program for certain days. I would have that conference last at least one week. I would have a time fixed at which that conference was to sit. I would have a time fixed with a definite program. One day would have a lecture on the part press, as to the management of that party press, as to the editorship, as to the style of articles that were desired, as to the best methods of circulating those papers and advancing them in the neighborhood. I would have questions of organization. In other words, I would learn from the prohibitionist, I would learn from the church, I would learn from every other organization every one of the ideas and tricks and methods that have given them a hundred times the power and influence that they would have had if it had not been for those methods. I am not satisfied with either article, and that is the reason I am opposing it.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I am opposed to all the amendments, and I am in favor of the substitute motion of Comrade Pope of Missouri. I believe the recommendations of the committee and the amendment practically means a national convention by appointment, and means that people ought to be sent there, not in view of their merits, but because they happen to hold a certain position in the party. It has been intimated here that a conference of various editors will have no effective value; in other words, they will not be able to carry out their decisions immediately, but they will go to a referendum vote. Now, let us consider, if there is a convention in which all the editors of the papers, all the state secretaries and members of the National Committee decide certain things and have them submitted to a referendum vote, I want to ask you, what chance have you got to vote down a proposition of that kind. Here you have got all the editors on one side, you have got all the state secretaries on the other side, and they will all want to carry anything that this convention or conference may decide. I say if it is nec-

sary to have a special convention for the purpose of deciding theoretical questions, let us have a convention elected by a referendum vote of the membership of the party and not by appointment, which probably means delegates to a convention just to consider special matters. I say a comrade who happens to be a state secretary may be a very efficient man in his own work and may be a very efficient man in clerical work, and yet may not be an efficient man to be sent to a national convention. I say if you want to have or to hold a national convention, let it be of members elected by the membership and not by appointment.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I would like to ask for another reading of Del. Pope's substitute so as to make sure about some phrases in it.

Del. Reilly read as follows: Pope's substitute is that a convention composed of members elected by referendum vote shall be held in all even-numbered years when no regular convention is to be held, to consider and report recommendations upon program, agitation and organization of the party.

DEL. LEE: I regret that I did not get the floor before Comrade Pope, because I have a substitute for the whole that is much shorter as well as simple, but of course it is out of order now. I wanted to move simply that a regular national convention of the party be held in every even-numbered year. This would effect all the purposes which you are trying to effect by the proposition of the committee, by the two amendments and by the substitute. It would effect it and at the same time entirely obviate the objection to having a convention or conference or whatever you call it that is at least partly appointive instead of representative. It would not involve materially greater expense, and perhaps not greater expense than the conference that you propose in the committee arrangement. It would not prevent the holding of conferences of Socialist editors, organizers and so forth, because as a matter of fact most of the editors and organizers and state secretaries do often serve in our ordinary conventions as delegates, but they are elected

because they are considered to be qualified as delegates. All this would command greater respect from the party membership than any irregular or special conference of the sort contemplated by the committee report and by the amendments, and it would have yet another advantage over those and over the special sort of convention contemplated in Comrade Pope's substitute for the whole. I do not see any reason, in the first place, I say, why we should have this sort of semi-official conference instead of a convention. And if we can have a convention elected by a referendum vote just in the same way that our nominating convention is elected as Comrade Pope suggests; if we give them any power, shall that convention have power only to consider and recommend, while a convention held in the presidential year is supposed to have power to act just as it has at the present time? Now, comrades, the shortest and most effective way to go about it is just the short, straight line. We know—and I have no doubt this has influenced the minds of the members of the committee—we know that the parties in the various countries of Europe, as a rule, hold their conventions annually, and we know it has a very good effect on the party if they do hold their conventions annually. This country is so large and holding conventions so expensive that it is impracticable or has been for us to hold our conventions annually. I do believe, however, that we are reaching the point where it would be quite practicable for us to hold regular conventions bi-annually at least, and if it should be necessary make those conventions somewhat smaller, make the basis of representation one for 500 instead of one for 400, or whatever it happens to be; make the basis somewhat smaller. That would be better than to go on only once in four years and rush through our work in some respects very badly, as we are doing it at this time. I would like to have had an opportunity to introduce my substitute for the whole, which would provide simply that a regular national convention of the party be held in every even-numbered year.

DEL. POPE: If I get my second

to consent I will take that suggestion and let it be the substitute.

DEL. LEE: I thank you. I wanted to do it while ago.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? If there is no objection, then with the common consent Comrade Lee's suggestion will now become a motion as a substitute for the whole.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. The document now on the floor is section 1, Article X, which states that we shall hold a convention every four years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Technically that is true, but at the same time it, would not be fair to rule on it.

THE DELEGATE: That can be obviated by calling it a nominating convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will not sustain that point, because we may change that later if we wish to.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I am afraid I shall have to speak in favor of Comrade Lee's substitute, though it is with great regret that I do so. It is not nearly so interesting as the form that was developing for the conference which we would have if things had gone on a little farther. The things are getting very close to me. I thought I was to be included in the regular form eventually. I thought the state and county organizers and secretaries would certainly be included and that I should not have to start a Socialist newspaper a month before this convention began. (Laughter.) As it is, that is rendered unnecessary, and I shall have to take my chances probably with the others of being elected. In fact, I think in spite of some disadvantages to some organizers and Socialist editors and so forth, it is after all the best way to let those come to that convention whom the membership actually want, instead of, of course, the ones that they should have. (Laughter.)

DEL. GOEBEL: May I ask a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: If he consents.

DEL. GOEBEL: I would like to ask the comrade to tell me when it has been possible for the state secretaries and organizers to get together

even for four hours during this convention for a conference?

DEL. JOHNS: Well, I don't think that there would be any greater probability of their getting together as secretaries or organizers, Comrade Goebel, if the choice of the membership for delegates to the convention were excluded by the form. I think it is up to them in the convention whether they should get together or not. If they don't come here it is probably because the membership didn't care to have them come here. Of course, the desirability of having the organization that the membership should have is great, but it should be remembered that in the end the only results of any value in the movement itself will be gained and determined by the intelligence of the membership as a whole, and that the membership must gain insight before anything can be accomplished, and they can get right only through practice in making mistakes. Therefore, in spite of the loss of interest in this conference, I am in favor of Comrade Lee's substitute.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I rise to support the substitute offered by Comrade Lee and accepted by the others, for several reasons. In the first place, I believe that the Socialist party rank and file is quite competent to decide upon the ones that it wishes to attend this conference or convention, and I am becoming very tired of hearing the cheap demagoguery that is used constantly in democratic and republican arguments against popular rule, against direct legislation and against the referendum, when used in a Socialist convention. (Applause.) Whenever a member of that very select company, referred to in terms of pink tea by the comrade from the West, gets up to speak on any matter that seems to concern his chances or the chances of his clique to rule the Socialist Party, he begins to assault one of the main principles of Socialism, direct legislation. Without direct legislation Socialism itself would be impossible, and without direct legislation the proper management of the Socialist Party would be impossible. I have taken pride in a great many states of this union and in a great many cities and country villages of this country, in saying that the So-

cialist Party stands for direct legislation and practices it by running its party on the referendum plan (applause), and I should be very sorry to have to go before these comrades again and apologize in having to explain that it has ceased to be so democratic as it was before. I am in favor of this convention coming in this year between the national campaigns, because I believe the result of this convention will be of advantage to the party. The educational influence and the unifying influence of this convention, and especially of this biennial convention, will be worth a hundred times more to the party than it costs. (Applause.) I believe with all my heart that if we had more of those conferences we would have not only a larger personal acquaintance, but it would be helpful. I am very happy to be able to agree with so many New York comrades in this matter of this referendum. I would like to suggest that it might be, if the comrades desire others besides those elected to come and have a voice in this convention, that another section might be added, and, if it is the will of this convention, to have these specified comrades come and have a voice in the national convention, and also Comrade Barnes. I would not object to that, but I do wish to insist with all my power, not only now but always, on a referendum of these matters to the party itself, and I do approve with all my heart this convention that is proposed.

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: I wish to ask Comrade Lee whether he intends this section introduced by him and accepted by Comrade Pope will simply take the place of the entire section, including the portion already adopted under "Conventions." I so understand it.

DEL. LEE: I do so understand it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the previous question shall now be put. All in favor—

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): A point of order. If you adopt this to take the place of what was adopted it would abolish the convention, for the



nomination of president and vice president.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether that is true or not. If it is, it is a serious point.

DEL. POPE: That is what I understood when I agreed to Comrade Lee's motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not sustained.

DEL. POPE: I want to present this question: When I accepted Comrade Lee's suggestion it was with this purpose; I had accepted it as a second section in that article. I did not mean to leave out the first clause there for a national convention which means to nominate. I did not mean that; I meant to accept it as a second part.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have been proceeding this morning by common consent and courtesy so as to get through, and we have got into confusion a little by doing it, but let us find out and get what we want. I will listen to Comrade Lee, because he is involved.

DEL. LEE: If Comrade Pope yielded to me with a certain understanding of the purport of my motion, I think in fairness I should not insist on my amendment in that form.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is fair.

DEL. LEE: I suppose it will involve some editing of the words of the two sections, and for my part I am quite willing to entrust that to the constitution committee or whoever may have charge of the matter.

DEL. BERGER: A point of order. You cannot edit that section. The editing must be done on the constitution as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is sustained.

DEL. BERGER: We cannot edit a part of the constitution. By adopting the last substitute we abolish the convention to nominate president and vice-president.

DEL. LEE: I mean distinctly editing for style.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is sustained.

DEL. CARR: A question of information. Is it not true that if we accept this section as proposed by Comrades Pope and Lee it is only necessary

to reconsider the first section and put in the word "nominating"? That will save lots of time. Let us adopt it and get done.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): A point of order. A motion has been made and seconded for the previous question, and no more discussion is allowed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is not sustained. Comrade Hunt of Illinois has the floor.

DEL. PAULITSCH (N. Y.): I appeal from the decision.

DEL. HUNT: I yield the floor to Comrade Simons.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I wish to ask the chair and the committee also, doesn't the substitute offered by Comrade Lee destroy the purpose for which the conference or convention is called? There are certain papers designated, according to this committee report, whose representatives are to attend this conference especially. If I understand his proposition, it was to the effect that they were to be elected or be delegates to the convention. The very men that the constitutional committee wish most to be in this conference would not then be present.

A DELEGATE: Wasn't it an educational conference that was intended?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct. Now, let us ask the secretary to read the proposition.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): Mr. Chairman, not one time during this discussion has anyone said that if we don't vote in favor of the editors coming they could not come here and would not come. But they can come here and will come here. Then what is the use of all this discussion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will now read what is before us.

ASST. SEC. REILLY: There was first the report of the committee which Comrade Gaylord read, and which I would read if somebody had not taken my copy. The next was an amendment by Spargo of New York.

DEL. SPARGO: Since the purpose of the amendment has been served, with the consent of my second, might I withdraw that?

ASST. SEC. REILLY: All right. Then the next was a substitute by

Comrade Pope of Missouri, and afterwards that substitute was changed by Comrade Lee with the consent of Pope and as now changed reads that "A regular National Convention of the party shall be held in each even-numbered year."

DEL. POPE: Do you call that Section 2 of that article?

ASST. SEC. REILLY: I don't know what you would call it.

DEL. POPE: If that is what it is, we want to know it, because one contradicts the other.

ASST. SEC. REILLY: You will have to ask somebody else.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard what the secretary read. As I understand the motion now before us, the amendment is the one offered by Del. Pope, taken by Del. Lee, to the effect that a convention shall be called every two years. If we don't want that we can vote it down and start over again and get what we do want. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) All in favor of this as read by the secretary—

DEL. SLOBODIN: This is what? The amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the amendment offered by Comrade Pope. All in favor, say aye. Opposed, no. The votes seem to have it.

Division called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, understand what you are voting on. It is the motion offered by Comrade Pope of Missouri, understand, that you are voting on, which is this: To substitute for the report of the committee the following: "A regular national convention of the party shall be held in every even-numbered year." All those who are in favor of this raise your hands until the secretary has counted them. Opposed, raise your hands. The vote stands 61 for, 46 against. The motion is carried and the section is adopted. What is your further pleasure? The section as adopted reads, instead of the committee's report, as follows: "A regular national convention of the party shall be held in every even-numbered year." If that conflicts in any way with the other you want to bring in your motion now and straighten it out.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I move

to reconsider the action taken in adopting the first part of that paragraph. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved to reconsider the action taken in adopting the first part of that recommendation.

DEL. FARRELL: And in connection with that, that is to be drafted to correspond and be in harmony with that which was adopted; that is to say, to the extent that our national conventions be held every two years in even-numbered years.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to reconsider the action by which we decided to hold our national conventions.

DEL. FARRELL: National nominating conventions.

DEL. C. L. FURMAN (N. Y.): I think it is unnecessary to reconsider. I think I have a word that will clear it up. Instead of stating "a regular national convention," if you state "a regular national convention of the party shall be held," that will clear it up.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to reconsider it. All in favor of reconsidering, say aye. Opposed, the same. Carried.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): I move to amend by making Section 1 read, "A regular convention of the party shall be held in every even-numbered year."

DEL. KERR (Ill.): A question of information. Is it not true that the adoption of this substitute will be sufficient, and if we have that new section we will have to reconsider this other, and it is only for the purpose of striking it out in order that there may not be a conflict? A motion to strike out will settle it all. Isn't that motion made?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no motion before the house at the present time.

DEL. KERR: Then I move to strike out the first section. (Seconded.)

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): It seems to me, as to the time of the convention, that we should have a convention held every presidential year for the purpose of nominating candidates and adopting a platform and have a convention meet between times for

the purpose of considering party organization and propaganda; and I suggest or move as a substitute for the original sentence, that we insert the words "A regular national convention of the party shall be held in all years in which elections for president and vice president are held, for the purpose of adopting a platform and nominating candidates," and then leave the second clause as we have adopted it, in this meets with the wishes of the comrades. Let me state it again. I have got five minutes to make it plain. Every four years we adopt a platform and nominate a ticket, and we want in between times to have our convention free from adopting the platform or nominating a ticket, and open to do something that we have long neglected, getting a conference for the purpose of organizing and systemizing our organization and propaganda. (Applause.) And I want to say that it is my opinion and the opinion of other comrades here, that while our platform and resolutions are important, yet organization and propaganda are also important; and we have at this convention adopted no measures for permitting our comrades who are working to get together and find out how to work better. It is the intention of this second convention to enable them to get together. I want to say that at the conferences of the state secretaries, of which we had three, for an hour and a half, or an hour, at which over half of the state secretaries and organizers met, they did not talk hot air, but they got down to business. (Applause.) I believe that Comrade Chase or any other comrade who took part in that conference will agree that we talked more solid substantial business in the hour, or hour and a half, than they could possibly talk on organization and propaganda before a convention which comes here for the purpose of nominating a ticket and adopting a platform. Let me state my motion again: That every four years we have a convention to nominate a ticket and adopt a platform, and every two years between, we do not adopt a platform or nominate, but we have it as a conference of the workers of the Socialist Party, selected, if you please, out of the com-

rades' who have experience by the membership of their own state. They have got sense enough to know who are doing the work, and I trust they will send the workers to that body. One more point, as to the expense. The railroad fare for this convention is \$8,000, and I will go back to Oklahoma and I will raise \$700 more or begin to raise it to send the workers to this workers' convention, through a tax on every member for four years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to the motion? (Motion seconded.) It has been moved and seconded to substitute Comrade O'Hare's motion in place of the one that was offered.

DEL. FARRELL: I move as an amendment to the motion, that this matter be referred to the committee to draft it in its proper form and bring it in at our afternoon session. (Seconded.)

The motion of Del. Farrell to refer to the Constitution Committee for the purpose of bringing in a revised draft was carried.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I wish to make a suggestion. The way the sections of this article were drafted before by this committee, in view of the fact of considering the section as such, before they will all have to be considered again by the committee and changed somewhat. Therefore I suggest that we go on to the next article and leave this article till the committee reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is a good suggestion.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: It cannot be done except by motion.

DEL. HAGEL: I would like to state my reasons why I think we should go ahead. I would like to insert a paragraph stating that in the future when there is no presidential election the representation in the convention shall be one for each state and one additional delegate for every 600 members.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can make that suggestion to the committee by going to them. The next order of business. We will now proceed to article XI, leaving this present article for revision by the committee.

Del. Gaylord read the first section of Article XI, as follows:

Section 1. Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership, upon the request of twenty local organizations, in five or more states or territories, or any smaller number of local organizations having a membership of at least 2,000 in the aggregate; provided, however, that the required number of requests for such a referendum shall all have been made within a period of 90 consecutive days.

DEL. GEYLDOR: I wish to say that all after the word "provided," as to the required number, etc., is additional to the former draft of the constitution, and that I believe is the only change.

It was moved to adopt the section. DEL. WORK (Iowa): I want to make a motion to amend. I want to amend by putting in the words "or branch" after the word "local" in both places. It should read "local or branch," because there are a number of places like Illinois, for instance, where the local takes in the whole country. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): This proposition might appear very simple to our comrades in the western states where they have no large branches in the cities, but it is different in New York where there are some eight or ten foreign speaking branches run by one member, probably. I say you cannot apply the same rule to a branch as to a local. It will be very easy for anyone to get the required number of endorsements if you allow the branches to make an endorsement the same as a local. I say if a local is divided into more than one branch it should require another local to endorse a proposition before it is endorsed.

DEL. O'NEILL (Wyo.): I would like to call the attention of the comrades to the fact that to make this depend on 2,000 members would require one-sixth of the total membership of the party that voted on the last referendum. It would take a very big per-

centage to ask for a referendum, and it would be very hard to get that number to support a demand for a referendum. I would like to cut that down to 500, and I make a motion to that effect.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I just wish to make the point that if we are to pit a city like New York with all its branch organizations as a local or a city like Chicago with all its branch organizations as a local against a single branch of ten members in some small, sparsely populated county, it would be very unfair. The average branch in New York City is as large as the average branch throughout the whole country. The whole of Cook County is one local in Illinois, and we do not want, for instance, Danville with a membership of 40 or 50, to have as much power in the referendum or in the appeal for a referendum as all of Cook County. Therefore if you add the word "branch" it will make it

just, so that any ward branch of a city may count for one, the same as a local in a small town in the country. I submit that if there are 2,000 votes or 20 branches in New York City that want a referendum they have a right to it. Still, as there are 2,000 members scattered over a whole state or two or three states in some other part of the country, if we leave the word "local" here it will pit a local in Chicago or New York against branches in the country, which is not fair. Therefore I am in favor of the amendment proposed by Comrade Work.

DEL. RIGG (Idaho): The objection of the comrade is not well taken, inasmuch as it requires five different states. It is not a branch of one state that may demand it, but it must come from five different states, and I think his position is not well taken on that.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I think any measure should be put through here that will allow a referendum to be called by the membership within a single state. We do not want every single state row that starts in this country to be brought directly into the national organization. We do not want a demand for the referendum unless it has the backing of the locals of at least one or two other states. If there are not three or four states that want it, we don't want it.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I am opposed to the amendment offered by Comrade Work, because there is no reason for it. Whenever we want a referendum, we can go ahead and get a referendum. If you adopt Work's amendment, you establish a bad precedent and a very bad rule. We recognize the local as the unit of organization. In the branch subdivision, it can initiate a referendum as far as the local is concerned, but it cannot and has no power to initiate a referendum as far as the state organization is concerned; and if you adopt Comrade Work's amendment, if any local in the city of New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, or any other large city, or a branch as he calls it, is in favor of anything of any moment, it can go ahead and get a second and make or initiate a referendum vote, and you simply have that one part, and possibly a very small part, of a local to initiate or assist to bring about the initiation of a referendum which the whole local is against. Therefore it would be very bad practice to adopt that. If there is any branch that wishes to initiate a referendum, let them get the endorsement of the whole local before they initiate it.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): It seems to me that the matter as drafted there should be adopted to constitute our organization. The number of states included there is only one-eighth of the states of the union. The membership at the present time is about 40,000, with only one-twentieth of our membership required for this purpose. Isn't that enough? Our organization is destined to grow much more rapidly in the future than in the past. Therefore I say, as we have wasted much valuable time in our convention and left some of the critical work for the last twenty-four hours, let us adopt this recommendation of the committee and you will make no mistake.

DEL. WORK: I made this motion, for the benefit of the local in Chicago. I want it to be generally understood, because for example I live in a town where we only have one local and no branches whatever. The local has somewhere between 50 and 100 members, and the present section as reported by the committee gives our local there with 50 or 75 members as

much power as the whole of Local Cook County or the whole of Local New York City, and I want our local only to have the same power which one assembly district has in New York City, so (turning to the New York delegation) I say I make the motion for your benefit, not for ours.

DEL. KONIKOW (Mass.): I am in favor of Comrade Work's amendment. Comrade Solomon says that some of the foreign branches are run by one member. I emphatically protest against that. The foreign branches ought to stand exactly the same chance as any other branch. I think there is another provision that to have a referendum vote we need twenty branches, and if we accept Comrade Work's amendment, in order to have a referendum it would have to go before the whole country. Now, they seem to think that we members of the party have nothing else to do but count votes. Do you think it is no labor for any branch to get 2,000 members to send out a certain referendum vote? Do you think we have nothing else to do but just work for votes? It is mighty hard work to get a referendum vote out to go before the different branches. It will really handicap the members in the large cities to bring a referendum vote before the party at all if we leave it entirely to the local. That is why I think we must try our best to give a chance to bring a referendum vote before the party in any special locality. That is, it seems to me, the intention of some here. I had some experience in the old S. L. F., where they required fifteen branches to send out a referendum. I think if there is a local with twenty or twenty-five branches and a branch wants to bring a referendum vote before the party, then it will be hard enough to get twenty others to endorse it. Therefore I think it is best to give a chance to all our comrades.

DEL. STROBEL (N. J.): I am in favor of the amendment of Comrade Work simply because I think it ought not to be in the power of locals in the large cities to throttle those that want to express their views. That is all I have got to say.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): There are some comrades here who seem to

have constituted themselves guardians of the referendum and of the minorities in New Jersey, and they always want to guard the minorities in New York. We know how they have guarded them. We have had some experience. Now, we are just as much entitled to a referendum as they are, but this constitution does not recognize anywhere the existence of branches of locals. This is the first time it recognizes that there are branches of locals. The unit of organization in all our local organizations is the local. The national secretary has not got the names of the secretaries of branches; he does not know officially of the existence of branches; he knows of the existence of locals only. It will tend to disrupt the large locals if the minorities are allowed to rule. It is the principle of our organization, whether it is a national or state, or local, or branch organization, that the majority rules. If a minority should be authorized by the national constitution to initiate things against the will of the members, then it will tend to disrupt the large locals. Now, there is a provision here giving the large locals preference over the small, and then there is a two thousand membership provision, which means that in any local containing 2,000 members—and even Local Cook County or Local New York has 2,000 members—it can initiate a referendum, and that is all we want. We do not want to have branches everywhere trying to initiate a referendum. We have got to deal with the local through the national organization.

Del. Williams of Minnesota moved the previous question. The motion was seconded and carried.

The amendment offered by Del. Work was then put to a vote and lost.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I want to make a further amendment to that. I do not believe that Local Cook County or Local New York ought to have the right alone to initiate a referendum, and yet it seems to me we ought to recognize their increased power, but I do not think that in any one state or city they ought to have, that power. So, therefore, I would insert there the words "or any smaller number of local organizations having a membership of at least 2,000 in the

aggregate and reaching into at least two states."

A DELEGATE: "Three."  
DEL. SIMONS: Well, I am willing to take three, but I think there ought to be at least twenty members somewhere else in the United States that want that referendum, besides the one local.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you made it three?

DEL. SIMONS: Three states.  
DEL. GAYLORD: Make it sure; "or any smaller number of local organizations in" two or three?

DEL. SIMONS: Three states will suit me.

Del. Simon's amendment was seconded.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): The tendency of this convention is to ignore the referendum. We have several things passed that ought not to be accepted when this affair goes out to a referendum vote. I want to say this, Comrade Chairman and fellow delegates, that the basis of the Socialist organization is the membership, and not geographical division. I am not in favor of establishing a precedent that will tie the country against the city. It is the old story over and over. They are forcing the issue of the country against the city. I believe that where the membership lies the power ought to lie. I am not in favor of extending the chances for squabbles all over the country. We have enough of it now, and I want to go on record as opposing any tendency to destroy the referendum vote or the membership work in this party organization. It will never do, and it will destroy the very thing for which we are organized. We have our faults; we are making mistakes by doing this or by doing something else, but we will make a bigger mistake by establishing any precedent whereby we take away from the membership the power to vote on any question they want to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. FARRELL: I want to say this. Comrade Fraenckel ought to realize that it has been the experience in our Socialist movement that where a local desired to initiate a

referendum and placed a matter fairly before any other four or five locals, it has succeeded. Our Socialists are not such fools that they won't give you a show on a proposition if you fairly place it before them.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will read the motion.

DEL. GAYLORD: Do you accept my phrasing, Comrade Simons, which is, if amended, "or any smaller number of local organizations in three states having 2,000 members in the aggregate"?

DEL. SIMONS: Yes.

The section as modified by the committee was then adopted.

Section 2 was then read by Del. Gaylord, as follows:

Section 2. Whenever a request for a referendum shall have been made as above provided, the National Secretary shall forthwith cause the same to be published in the party press, and shall allow such question to stand open for thirty days, within which time amendments may be offered thereto in the same manner in which an original request for a referendum is to be made, and at the close of the said period of thirty days the original motion submitted to referendum, together with all and any amendments which may have been offered, shall be submitted to the vote of the party members, and such vote shall close fifty days thereafter.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): Is it the understanding of the committee that these referendums shall be published in the Bulletin?

DEL. GAYLORD: It does not say so.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: It is announced in the weekly Bulletin, which is the manner of publication, and goes to such of the press as desire to use it. It is generally used.

The section was then adopted.

The next section was read:

Section 3. All propositions or other matters submitted for the referendum of the party shall be presented without preamble or comment.

The section was adopted without objection or discussion.

Section 1 of Article XII was read and adopted, as follows:

Section 1. The formation of all state or territorial organizations, or the reorganization of state or territorial organizations which may have lapsed, shall be under the direction of the Executive Committee, and in conformity with the rules of the National Committee."

The next section was read:

Section 2. No state or territory may be organized unless it has at least ten locals with an aggregate membership of not less than 200, but this provision shall not affect the rights of states and territories organized prior to the adoption of this constitution. When the membership of any state averages less than 150 per month for any six consecutive months, the National Committee may revoke the charter of that state.

DEL. GAYLORD: I will say in explanation that the committee was of the opinion that where a state organization is not efficient to the point of maintaining its membership up to the figures of 150 for six consecutive months it calls for some sort of action to promote efficiency if possible.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I would like to ask Comrade Hurst, if he is present, how that will affect Rhode Island.

DEL. HURST: We have at this time 218. Last year we averaged 135.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: How will it affect Alabama?

DEL. WALDHORST: We have 250 members.

DEL. HENCK (Del.): I would like to state for Delaware that we were organized on county lines, and that it would be impossible for us to come under that head because we have only three counties.

DEL. GAYLORD: How many members?

DEL. HENCK: That is not the point. We never could be; there are only three counties in the state.

DEL. GAYLORD: This has nothing to do with counties. It is simply a question of how many members you have.

DEL. HENCK: I understood it as ten or more locals.

DEL. GAYLORD: Are you organized at present as a state organization?

DEL. HENCK: We are an unorganized state.

DEL. GAYLORD: Then it does provide that you must have at least ten locals.

DEL. HENCK: That is what I say. We have only three counties.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER: I move to strike out the number ten.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): I just want to refer to the point the comrade from Delaware raised, as to the manner in which it affects New Jersey, because it is organized; but Delaware is a very small state, the second smallest state in the union; it has only three counties and it probably would not be possible for that state to become an organized state organized on county lines. I think the purpose of the committee would best be served if "ten locals" was stricken out and we make it a "membership of 200."

DEL. SOLOMON: It seems to me the comrades don't understand that a state is usually composed of more than one city, and nothing prevents the comrades in Delaware from working along county lines, and whenever they are ready to organize the state as a state organization let them form their five or six or ten locals and they will then have the required number of locals in that state.

DEL. DOWNIE (Wash.): I move an amendment to change the word "with" to "or" in the third line, so as to read "or an aggregate membership of not less than 200." (Seconded.)

DEL. BRANSTETTER: Under the reading as amended, if there were ship of six in each local of the state, you would have a state organization able to be formed with sixty members, under this kind of organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are correct.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I just wish to call attention to the fact that we have been having the same difficulty we were in a while ago. The word "local" seems generally to refer to the county organization. The word "branch," I understand, is the real meaning of the proposition. It has been heretofore recognized that

branches having five members constituted a unit, and that a certain number of those branches could constitute a referendum. If the word "local" were changed to "branch," your difficulty would be obviated with reference to Delaware and other states.

The amendment of Del. Downie, changing "with" to "or," was adopted. THE CHAIRMAN: The action now returns on the motion to adopt the section as amended. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. HURST (R. I.): A point of information, as to the intent of this expression "may revoke." I take it that the intent is that that is not to be construed as "shall."

DEL. GAYLORD: No; it is not mandatory.

The section as amended was then adopted.

The next section was read:

"Section 3. The platform of the Socialist party shall be the supreme declaration of the party, and all state and municipal platforms shall conform thereto; and no state or local organization shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise with any other political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations, in order to favor the candidate of such other organizations, nor shall any candidate of the Socialist party accept any nomination or endorsement from any other party or political organization."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): May I ask a question? The question I want to ask is this: Suppose the Socialist Labor Party desires to endorse our candidates in any state in the union, how about that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Can't do it.

DEL. GAYLORD: We cannot accept it.

DEL. HAGEI (Okla.): I wish to amend by inserting "provided, when the Socialist party has no ticket in the field, that all members of the party must abstain from voting." (Amendment seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to amend as the comrade from Oklahoma will read.

DEL. HAGEI: I wish to amend

by inserting the following: "Provided, when the Socialist party has no ticket in the field, that all party members abstain from voting." The reason I ask for this amendment is that in a number of places where the commission form of government exists, in certain cases the Socialist party is driven from the field. It cannot have a ticket in the field, and we ought to abstain from voting in such cases.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I move to amend the clause to read that when a ticket is not placed in the field every Socialist shall go to the polls and write the word "Socialist" on the ballot. (Seconded.)

DEL. POPE (Mo.): In the State of Missouri they have a primary law that requires that if you do not go to the polls and vote at the primary you lose your right to vote. We are supposed to have common sense enough to go to the polls whether we have a candidate or not.

DEL. BERGER: If you adopt this it would make it impossible for us in Wisconsin to go into the field in many cases. For instance, under the state law judicial elections are non-partisan. Now, while we put up a ticket it goes on the ballot as a non-partisan ballot. Neither the Republican, nor Democratic, nor Social Democratic party can put up a partisan ticket. They all go on as non-partisan tickets. If you adopt this, we cannot have any ticket. We have a good chance in that state to elect our judges, but we have to elect them as non-partisan judges. You cannot have all this rot and so on; it is pure and sheer nonsense. It is also sheer nonsense to compel us to stay out of the election entirely. Then there may be a state law passed this winter to make the municipal election at Milwaukee non-partisan. What will you do then? Of course we will have our ticket, but it will be a non-partisan ticket. So if you accept this you make it impossible for us to participate in any further elections, judicial or local. If you adopt this, then we have a chance to vote just once in two years or once in four years. Now, we cannot accept this.

DEL. HAGEL: I want to ask a question. Is it not a fact that whenever this occurs, it is the Socialist party that does put the ticket in the

field, but it does it in the name of a non-partisan affair?

DEL. BERGER: Yes; we do it. We put up a ticket, but it is non-partisan.

DEL. GROESBECK (Wyo.): In the choice of two evils, it is better to take neither, nor the least.

DEL. BERGER: This is not a choice of two evils. We put up a ticket, but it does not go on the ballot as a Socialist ticket; it goes on as a non-partisan ticket. For instance, our judicial ticket this spring; we had a ticket at the municipal election from top to bottom, but the man nominated for judge did not go on as a Social Democratic candidate. Under the law he had to go on as a non-partisan candidate for the judiciary; that is the requirement of the law. So if you accept anything providing that we cannot vote unless "Socialist ticket" is on the top, then you cut us out. Don't you understand me? You simply cut us out.

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): This clause is absolutely foolish; it is very foolish. The whole trend of events is today towards non-partisan tickets. We Socialists don't want it, but we cannot help ourselves, we are in the minority. The trend of the entire nation is today towards non-partisan tickets. There are countries in the world already where the non-partisan ticket exists, and if the old politicians inside of four years or at any time carry any number of cities for the non-partisan tickets, it means that about half of the Socialist party will be disfranchised. Besides, how am I going to keep track of a man, whether he votes the party ticket or not? It is not possible to keep track of them. This has absolutely no meaning. It can hurt nobody but ourselves.

DEL. KILLINGBECK (N. J.): If we adopt that, it will mean that three counties in New Jersey will be unable to vote on a single question. I don't want to make a speech or reiterate what the other delegate says, but it is a fact that it will be impossible for us to vote on a single question in at least three counties.

DEL. GAYLORD: Our party is a political party. The school boards and judiciary are elected by non-partisan vote. This motion if adopted

would take away the political party, or the party where it was strong and otherwise able to do something practical. Our party has but three members on the school board in Milwaukee, elected on a non-partisan ticket. Do you want us to take them off? We have got a first class chance of putting a man on the bench this spring on the non-partisan ticket. Don't you want us to do that? If you don't want us to do that, what do you want us to do? DEL. TUCKER (Cal.): I don't wish any act to be done here to prevent the Socialist party from putting its candidate on the ticket, but I think we should take such steps as are possible to see to it that while we are at it we prevent the possibility of putting candidates on the ticket who are independents. The organization should select those candidates and should as an organization stand back of them. Now, in California we have precisely this situation: many cities have adopted the non-partisan plan of election, and unless we have in force some rule it will enable members in those places where the organization is lax to lay down and allow individuals to go out with individual petitions and get on the ballot as independents without the support or by the authority of the Socialist organization in that city. We have a case of that in the county of Alameda, where I came from. Under the law of Alameda the same law you refer to is in force as to the non-partisan ticket, and in that city they took advantage of this from the fact that there is no rule, and a number of individual members rushed out with their individual petitions to secure the necessary signatures to put themselves on the ticket. The organization was not compelled under the constitution to take action, and we left it to a bit or miss proposition of the individual. Now, I understand this proposition would compel the organization as such to make the nominations in its organization, go back of the proposition of getting the signatures necessary to put them upon the ticket as independents, and then advertise them as the regular nominees of the Socialist party. If we cannot have the names printed upon the ballots the organization should stand back of them and for them and adver-

tise the fact that they are the representatives of the Socialist party, and not allow any individual to pose or nominate himself as the representative of the party. For this reason I hope this will be adopted.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): It does not seem to me that the amendment is necessary, nor that the adoption of this amendment would produce the desired effect in any case where that effect would not be produced without it. The section as reported by the committee is perfectly clear as to the spirit and intent of this convention, which represents the spirit and intent of the party. Now, there are circumstances, as has been pointed out, in Wisconsin, there are circumstances in Ohio with regard to the school boards, I believe, and there are circumstances in New Jersey with regard to the school committees, I believe, and it occurs in various places with regard to judicial, school, township or village nominations and so on, that we must comply with the law and at the same time comply with the letter of this proposed amendment. We have to comply with the law or else have no ticket in the field at all. We have to comply if we can, and in general we will comply, with the spirit of the party constitution. And I tell you, comrades, it is a lesson that we may learn from observing society around us. We have to learn the laws of the land and how they work; it is a lesson that we may apply in our party organization. You cannot always prevent wrong things from being done by putting a prohibition in the constitution, and I do not think I will do well to put too many prohibitions in the constitution. I am a member that I have read that in the exciting days of the convention in the French Revolution, when they were denouncing different men as traitors, as bad citizens, and ordering them under arrest, one very patriotic delegate got up and said, "Mr. President, I move that all the bad citizens be placed under arrest." Now, evidently the delegate's intention was very good, but unfortunately the proposition was something that could not be put into effect. You have to a certain extent to leave it to the common sense and good faith of members to obey

the spirit of the constitution, and when you go on putting in amendments and amendments that are always additions of more and more clauses, you simply increase the opportunities for misunderstanding, the opportunities for friction and for conflict; you simply make it more difficult for your constitution to work.

DEL. STEDMAN (Ill.): I want to move to table the amendment.

The motion was seconded and the amendment tabled.

DEL. INGALLIS (Minn.): I wish to ask the committee, would it not be advisable to put a clause in that section providing that no member of the Socialist party should become a non-partisan candidate in any state where

it is required? In other words, here we have got in a certain state—

DEL. GAYLORD: I understand the vote of the convention just settled that to the contrary of your idea.

The section was then adopted.

DEL. GOEBEL: I understand that a lot of the delegates' tickets expire tonight and they have got to leave at 6 o'clock. I can stay. I want to give them a chance to stay here until the convention's work is over. We do not need a long dinner hour today. I move that we adjourn to meet again at 1 o'clock.

The motion was seconded, and the convention then at 12:30 adjourned to meet at 1 o'clock p. m.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The convention was called to order at 1 o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know we are all anxious to get what little of our business is still remaining finished up, so as to get away. We have yet to hear the report of the Constitution Committee, the report of the Women's Committee, the report of the Finnish translator, and the report of the Committee on Ways and Means. There may be others.

A DELEGATE: There is still the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the Committee on Government by Commission.

### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION RESUMED.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrades, we are now at work on the constitution. The next order of business is the reading of the next section. Let us proceed.

DEL. GAYLORD: (reporting for the committee): The committee was instructed to redraft the section concerning the two kinds of convention. Your committee recommend the following. There are two sections under "Conventions," you will notice. The committee recommend that we insert the word "nominating" before

the word "convention," so that it reads:

The regular national nominating convention of the party shall be held in all years in which elections for President and Vice-President of the United States are to be held.

We recommend that that section stand thus. Then the second section we recommend should read as follows:

A congress of the party to consider and report upon the program, agitation and organization of the party, shall be held in each even-numbered year when there is no national nominating convention.

DEL. GAYLORD: Now, comrades, if I can speak a few minutes on the points included here, I think it will save time. I want to make the matter clear that we want to have two different kinds of conventions. As the second one proposed is for the study and consideration of party matters we thought it advisable that it should have a separate name, and we suggest that it be called a congress, in order to distinguish it from the convention which is supposed to be for nominating. The basis of representation should be such as to cut down the

number attending. I believe those are the essential points.

A DELEGATE: What is the basis proposed?

DEL. GAYLORD: I will say 800. I have that on my paper, but if you want to change it, that is for you to do, and you can do it easily. There is one other matter, in regard to the accrediting of the delegates; you will notice that in the section that follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the recommendation of the committee; are you ready to adopt it?

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): The basis of representation is not clear to me.

DEL. GAYLORD: One delegate for every 800, and one at large.

DEL. SOLOMON: I desire to amend the committee's report to read that there shall be one for every 500. (Seconded.)

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): To answer a question that was asked me by the chairman of this committee, there was \$8,000 spent for railroad fares at this convention for 220 delegates, which averages \$36 per delegate. On a basis of 12 cents per capita, which would be the tax in two years, the average appropriation for a delegation of 800 members for one delegate, will allow about \$96 per delegate for expenses. If we cut it down to one for 500 members, it would allow \$60. So you see we have considerable leeway. We can even go as low as a delegate for every 300 members. I simply say that if we did, it would cost just exactly the amount that was necessary to pay the expenses of this convention.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I believe one for every 500 is far more democratic. I am willing to give the minority every chance, but I don't believe in being ruled by the minority. By the present system New York or Wisconsin or any of the other big states can send only one for every 500, while a state with only 50 members sends the same. In other words, it takes about ten Socialists in Wisconsin or New York to have as much voting power as one in Vermont. I am very willing, as I say, to give every state, small or large, one delegate, but beyond that we ought to have a system whereby we shall not be ruled by the

minority. Even with one for 500, ten Socialists in Washington have as much voting power as 100 in Wisconsin or New York, and with one for 800 it would be still worse. That is why I advocate, in spite of the cost, to make it one for every 500.

The amendment was adopted.  
DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move the adoption of the section as amended. (Seconded.)

A DELEGATE: I want to speak on that motion. I believe we are making a serious mistake. I got an estimate from the National Secretary. If we hold this convention as proposed in 1910 we will swamp the national office with a \$3,000 or \$4,000 deficit. I don't think we have any business to do it. I think that instead of this proposed convention there should be a meeting of the National Committee. This eight or nine thousand dollars has to come out of the movement somehow or some place.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): We have already decided that question, and there is no use discussing it unless we reconsider our decision of this forenoon.

The question was called for, and the section as amended was then adopted.

Section 2 of the report, now becoming Section 3, was next read, and was adopted without objection. The section is as follows:

Section 3. Special conventions of the party may be held at any time if decided upon by general vote of the party membership.

Section 4 (former Section 3) was read.

Section 4. The dates and places of holding such regular or special conventions shall be fixed by the National Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection this section will be adopted. It is adopted.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I want to suggest the following amendment, that the time of holding the said convention shall be no earlier than the first of June, because on the first of June of every year the railroads give a reduced rate of one and one-third fare. For illustration, if we had held this convention a month later the party would have been saved two

or three thousand dollars in fares. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: If we change this, then they will change their rate to get ahead of you. That's all there will be to it.

The amendment was lost, and on motion the section was then adopted. Section 5, originally Section 4, was read as follows:

Section 5. The basis of representation in any national nominating convention shall be by states, each state and territory being entitled to one delegate at large and one additional delegate for every 400 members in good standing; provided, however, that no delegate shall be considered eligible unless he is a resident of the state from which the credential is presented.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): I wish to offer an amendment. I have here a tabulation showing the cost on the basis of one at large and one for every 200. If you will take these figures you will find that the small state with 200 members gets one delegate for each 100 members. My amendment is that we should have one delegate at large for each state, and one additional delegate for every 400 members or majority fraction thereof above the first 400. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON: I desire to offer a further amendment, that we add to the recommendation of the committee—

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that to be a substitute or an amendment?

DEL. SOLOMON: An amendment to the amendment; if there is another to add the words "Provided that the delegates shall have been members of the party for at least two years."

DEL. McDEVITT: We have already adopted a provision that every official should have been a member for at least three years.

DEL. SOLOMON: Delegates would not be officials.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before us is on the amendment offered by Del. McDevitt of California. Will the Secretary please read the amendment as offered by Comrade McDevitt?

DEL. GAYLORD: The amendment provides that a state shall be en-

titled to one delegate at large and one additional delegate for every 400 members or majority fraction thereof above the first 400.

DEL. McDEVITT: I accept the amendment.

DEL. INGALLS (Minn.): Do I understand that each state shall have one delegate for each 400 members or major fraction thereof, provided that no state shall have less than one delegate?

THE CHAIRMAN: No; provided, as I understand Comrade Solomon's suggestion, that you accepted, provided that these delegates shall have been members of the party at least two years. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. GAYLORD: Comrade McDevitt's motion is superfluous, because the states that have a greater delegation than one also get an additional delegate for the first 400. You get one delegate at large anyway, and if you have got 400 you get two delegates, and if you have more than 400 delegates you get an additional delegate for a major fraction of 400. It makes no difference at all. We can let it stand as it is.

The amendment of Del. McDevitt was adopted.

A DELEGATE: I want to offer an amendment and tell the reason why it is offered. In the last three lines is the provision that "No delegate shall be considered eligible unless he is a resident of the state from which the credential is presented." I want that changed to read: "A member of the party in the state from which he is sent," so that there will be no violation of the constitution.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): That is implied all the way through the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you insist upon that?

THE DELEGATE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to include in the section a provision requiring each delegate to be a member of the state from which he is sent. Are you ready for the question?

A DELEGATE: That is already in there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it already in there?

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): Not in that form. He ought to be "a resident of that state." I think the amendment offered by the comrade is superfluous. The delegates are elected by general vote of the party members in their state.

The amendment was lost on being put to a vote.

The section was adopted as amended.

The next section, No. 6, originally Section 5, was read:

Section 6. Railroad fare of the delegates going to and coming from the conventions and congresses shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by setting aside 10 per cent of the national dues for this purpose.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): For the Committee of Ways and Means I desire to offer a substitute for that section: That the fares shall be raised by an assessment of five cents in every quarter of the year when the convention is held.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): These special assessments are a nuisance.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I do not see any necessity for this amendment, as exactly the same thing is in the constitution. It provided for 10 per cent, and the Committee on Ways and Means suggests 10 per cent. Five per cent every second year is the same as 10 per cent in one year.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Here is the proposition submitted by the committee, which I hope will not be adopted.

I do not want to occupy your time, but I do want to say a few words in support of my opinion. I think the greatest accomplishment of this party from the organization standpoint, up to this time, is the fact that we have, by the special assessment levied recently, covered our entire liabilities on this score. There was not a man in the movement, I believe, who thought we would be able to do that; not a man who believed that we had sufficient vim and sufficient money in our organization to rise to the occasion. Aside from that, I think it is an excellent means of agitation, preparing for a convention. Every member of the party, by reason of this special assessment, has been personally appealed to on the question

of this convention. It has been brought to his attention that we are going to have a national Socialist convention on May 10th. All are asked, as individual members, to contribute a certain sum, mutually agreed upon, to meet the expenses of that convention. Thus it is brought home to them; not only to them, but to a number of persons outside of our party, who have had their attention drawn to the fact that we are going to have a national convention. The result has been that where members have paid their special assessments, their interest has followed their contribution, and this convention has attracted more attention than any convention held by the American Socialist Party. I believe this result will follow in the future from a special assessment. The fact that the comrades over the country have so responded induces me to believe they will do so again. The agitation started several months before the convention assembled. For that reason I believe that a special assessment, whenever it is required in the convention year, is the best means of covering this fund.

DEL. GAYLORD: I owe the convention and Comrade Kraft an apology, and I wish to make it. In the minority report, under the heading "Article X," half way down the last column of the printed page, you will find, under Section 5, which is offered by Comrade Kraft of the committee as a substitute for that which has been read:

Railroad fare of the delegates, going to and coming from the convention, shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by a per capita assessment on the entire membership. (No delegate from any state shall be allowed voice or vote in the convention until this assessment from his state shall have been paid in full.)

DEL. SPARGO: I move the adoption of the minority report. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): We hear a good deal about the agitation effect of this 35-cent assessment. Now, we know that this is a proletarian movement, and we know that we are just

at the beginning of an industrial depression. We know further that our party membership is steadily increasing, and to make our party membership right we must go to work and make it as easy as possible to bear the burdens that come upon it. With the increase of membership we have increased means. Now, it makes no difference—and I have had experience in these things for years—it makes no difference how much money you raise, you can always find a way to spend it. You can also argue that when you have certain sums of money raised you can set it aside for certain specific purposes. The first special assessment may work very well, the second one may call out a kick, and the third one perhaps something different which we do not desire. I have no doubt that the next national convention, instead of representing 41,000 members, will represent away over 100,000 members. We have minimized the number of delegates possible by doubling the requirements, making it 400 instead of 200. Now, let us go to work and say to the proletarian whom we ask to join this party: "We are going to ask you to pay for everything that is done in the party. This is your party, but we are not going to make it so burdensome that the tax we impose upon you will drive you out of the party." I believe that the setting aside of 10 per cent is the common-sense proposition of the proletarian movement.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I want to speak in favor of the minority report. The last part of Section 5 says: "No delegate from any state shall be allowed voice or vote in the convention until this assessment from his state shall have been paid in full." If I understand the meaning of this clause it means that if a state is entitled to ten delegates, and they have only happened to pay at the time of the convention the assessment for eight delegates, then the other two shall not be seated. Am I right? If the state has only paid the assessment for 1,500 members at the time the convention is in session, they will be deprived of two delegates, or three, as the case may be.

DEL. GAYLORD: May I inter-

pret it as the committee understood it? No delegate shall be seated until the assessment shall have been paid in full.

DEL. SOLOMON: What assessment?

DEL. GAYLORD: The full assessment. "No delegate from any state shall be allowed voice or vote until this assessment shall have been paid in full." That shuts out the whole delegation from that state.

DEL. SOLOMON: That is so much the worse. I say it is a very dangerous proposition and will involve great confusion, in many forms. It will take us ten days to seat the national delegates.

DEL. BERYN: I have had a little bit of experience with this special assessment business. People who are members of the various fraternal societies know that a decrease of membership occurs during the time that they take up a special assessment, or have a semi-annual assessment for the purposes of defraying national or general expenses of the organization. My trade union has had this experience, and every trade union that ever tried it has had the same experience.

DEL. JACOBS (Wis.): There will sometimes come a time, as it is this year for instance, when for a member to pay this special assessment will be a burden. If we adopt this provision that no delegate shall be seated until the entire amount has been paid in full, how will it work out? Here is a state organization that has been at work as a state organization, spending their money as fast as they get it; they collect dues from the members during the year and spend this money for organizing purposes, and they buy their due stamps from the national organization. Now, you say they shall not be seated until they have paid the special assessment. Perhaps the times are such that they are not able to pay their special assessment. I am opposed to both of these propositions, the original report of the committee and the minority report, and I wish to offer a substitute for the whole, and I wish to explain why. My substitute is that "The railroad fare of the delegates going to and coming from the conventions shall be paid from the national

treasury." What sense is there in setting aside 10 per cent? If that is more than enough to pay it, it remains in the treasury; if it is not enough to pay, what are you going to do about it? Why not pay it from the national treasury?

DEL. SLOBODIN: Comrade Barnes has privately informed me that the average balance in the national treasury during the last year or so, the daily balance was about \$60 and the monthly balance about \$100. If conventions are to be held every two years, at an expense of \$7,000 or \$8,000 for the railroad fares of the delegates, where shall we get it?

DEL. GAYLORD: The idea is that out of the general funds of the organization a certain amount should be set aside for the purpose of meeting these expenses, and should always be held on hand and should not be spent for any other purpose, that is all. It stands to reason that you must either have a special assessment or you must set aside a certain amount for the purpose of paying these expenses; because the national office is run always according to the money on hand. It does not lay aside thousands of dollars for contingent expenses, unless authorized to do it.

DEL. PAULITSCH (N. Y.): I am opposed to the substitute offered by the delegate from Wisconsin, and also to the proposition of the minority committee. I believe the one brought in by the Constitution Committee is the right one, and I hope to see it adopted. I take this position because of the experience I have had with various organizations that I am affiliated with.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I want to explain the position of the State of New Jersey. There was no intention on the part of the framers of that resolution to debar any from the convention save those who are not provided for by the payment to the national treasury of the assessment. That is, if there is a delegation of ten, and the assessment has provided for but eight, two shall be excluded. That was the intention of this resolution, and it has simply been misstated in the minority report.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I believe we ought to make this section of our constitution a little bit elastic. I don't think we are going to lose anything by placing a little more power in the hands of our National Secretary and Executive Committee, and if this 10 per cent fails to defray the expenses of any national convention, they should have the power to raise the balance in other ways. I would like to add, to the original proposition, that in case the 10 per cent fails to cover the expense of any national convention, that the National Executive Committee, in connection with the National Secretary, shall have the power to raise the necessary amount by a special assessment. It could probably be done by an assessment of two or three cents per member.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can bring that up after this is settled. The vote is first upon the substitute offered by Del. Jacobs of Wisconsin, providing that the funds for the delegates' fares shall be paid out of the general funds of the party. That has been offered as a substitute for the whole. Are you ready for the question? All in favor please say aye; contrary, no. The ayes have it and the motion is lost. The next question is on the minority report of the committee.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Since the delegates have divided this report in their argument, I think it would be well to divide the minority report, which covers two subjects, so that we can vote intelligently on each one. It reads as follows: "Railroad fares of the delegates going to and coming from the convention shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by a per capita assessment on the entire membership." That is one part of it; the other part is: "No delegate from any state shall be allowed voice or vote in the convention until this assessment from his state shall have been paid in full."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection we will divide the question into those two parts. (Question called for.) We will vote first on the part that we read first. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I wish to



say that I am in favor of the original report of the committee, for this reason, that we have a state organization fund for which dues are collected each month. The membership, instead of paying into this organization fund, had to pay this 35 cents to the national office, and it cost the State of Kansas about \$100 that went into the national treasury and came out of the state organization fund. I believe the national office ought to provide for the delegates' fares, and leave our state organization fund alone.

The question was put on the adoption of the first part of the minority report, and the result being in doubt, a vote was taken by a show of hands, resulting in the adoption of the part in question by a vote of 69 in favor and 34 against.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now comes upon the adoption of the second part of the minority report. The Secretary will read the second part.

Del. Gaylord read the second part. DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I move to amend by adding that the delegations be seated in proportion to the amount of assessment paid by their respective states. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.): I would like to ask the mover of that amendment, who is to decide which of the delegates are to be seated?

DEL. POPE (Mo.): If we have a provision of that kind the state that wants to select its delegates from the proletariat will be left behind. Some one will get up and say, "I will pay the fare," and he will be sent there. I am opposed to that part of it and hope you will vote it down. The Socialist Party is strong enough in New York and other places to help the weaker states.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): We have had in this convention 219 delegates, before some of them went home, representing a membership of 37,000 odd. Some of the states have paid in to the national treasury much more in proportion than the expenses of their delegation would amount to. The reason in most cases where a state has failed to pay its full quota of assessment or failed to have in sight, is because no effort was made

by the state organizations to get the assessment collected. Instead of that, time has been given to factional fights and retaining control, and, as a result, some states have come here with delegations out of all proportion to the amount that they have contributed to the railroad fares of the delegates.

The previous question was called for, and the amendment of Del. Kearns was lost.

The question was then put on the adoption of the second part of the minority report, and the motion was lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now recurs on the motion that was made early in the debate, providing that the expenses should be paid by special assessment of five cents a quarter during convention years. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I wish to call the attention of the convention to the fact that the special assessment this year was 35 cents, that many paid double, and that many who are not party members paid; and to fix the assessment so low as five cents a quarter will probably not provide enough money. I think it should be left to the body that fixed the assessment before, the National Executive Committee.

DEL. SOLOMON: I don't see the necessity of coming in now with another motion to make it five cents. Why not leave this matter entirely in the hands of the National Executive Committee? It may be that five cents will be too little; it may be that they will require more than that. I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now recurs on the adoption of the section as amended.

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I have another amendment, just a short one, namely, that the assessment be levied not later than the last of January in the convention year. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. CARR: I move that this matter be left to the National Executive Committee.

DEL. WILKE (Ga.): I move to lay upon the table the question of fix-

ing the time for levying the assessment. (Seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON: The motion is out of order for the reason that we have already voted on the other ground which we have taken.

The point of order was not sustained. The motion to lay on the table was then put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now comes on the adoption of the section as amended.

DEL. O'HARE: We have adopted a rule that the nominating convention shall be on the basis of 300—is that right?

A DELEGATE: 400.

DEL. O'HARE: I stand corrected.

Our next convention, according to that rule, will have 140 delegates, if we do not grow. If we grow to 40,000 we will have 165 delegates. There are 218 delegates here, and by the rules we have adopted our convention will be cut down one third. That rule was not adopted with the thought and consideration of this body. I do not think there is any man in this convention that knows how many delegates would be here according to the rules adopted, except those who have figured it out this way. Now, comrades, I don't wish to cut down the size of our national convention. I am in favor of increasing it to an economical size, but not an expensive or extravagant size; and I propose that we refer this schedule back to the committee to investigate if such change is well made when, with the funds at the disposal of our party, we might have a convention at least as large as this convention, and have, to that extent, that much democracy, instead of restricting it to 100 known names.

DEL. FIELDMAN: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. We have already decided that matter.

The point of order was sustained. DEL. O'HARE: I move a reconsideration. I voted for the motion, and I have a right to do it now that I have changed my mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade O'Hare will have to make his motion to reconsider after we have passed this point which is now before the house.

DEL. GAYLORD: I want to say

a word on the report of the committee. I am sorry, comrades, that we have rejected the method of the regular setting aside of a small amount from the regular assessments. You have got to raise the money somehow. If necessary to raise special funds for other purposes you can do it. The provisions of this constitution contemplate throwing the work of organization—an expense which has hitherto fallen upon the national office—more and more back upon the state organizations, putting them more and more upon their own resources, and helping them by aid from the national office where necessary. I am opposed to the adoption of the section as it has been amended. I hope that you will vote it down and introduce another section that will put it upon the basis originally reported.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now recurs on the adoption of the section as amended. Will the Secretary please read the section as it now stands before us, so that we will know where we are at?

The section was read, as follows: Railroad fares of delegates going to and coming from the conventions and congresses of the party shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by a per capita assessment on the entire membership.

The question was then put on the adoption of the section as read, and it was adopted.

Del. Gaylord then read Section 6 of Article X, which section, by reason of renumbering, became Section 7 instead of 6 as originally numbered. The section is as follows:

Section 6. That the election of delegates to the National Convention shall take place not later than sixty days preceding the National Convention and the respective State Secretaries shall furnish the National Secretary not later than thirty days preceding such convention with a list of the accredited delegates to the convention.

The National Secretary shall prepare for publication a printed roster of the accredited delegates, to be sent to each delegate and forwarded to the party press for pub-

lication. That such list shall contain the occupation of each delegate and his office or employment in the party. That all official reports required to be presented to the National Convention shall be printed and sent to each delegate elected at least fifteen days before the date of the convention and furnished to the party press for publication. At the time and place set for the opening of the National Convention the National Secretary shall call the convention to order, and shall call the roll to ascertain the number of uncontested delegates.

The following order of business shall be observed:

1. Election of Chairman for the day.
2. Election of Secretary, Reading Clerk and Sergeant-at-Arms.
3. Nomination of the following Regular Committees:  
Contested Seats—7 members.  
Platform—9 members.  
Constitution—9 members.  
Resolutions—9 members.  
Ways and Means—9 members.  
Reports of National Officers—7 members.  
International Relations—5 members.

After opportunity for declarations the complete list of nominations above provided for shall be printed at once in ballot form.

4. Report of Committee on Rules, appointed by the National Executive Committee, according to Article VI, Section 2.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is a minority report on this, that you will find under "Convention," where it reads: "Add to Article X after the last section: 'The Committees on Platform, Constitution and Resolutions shall be elected by a referendum vote four weeks prior and they shall meet two days prior to the convention.'" The adoption of which would cut out the Platform, Constitution and Resolutions Committees under item 3 of the rules of order specified.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the two reports, the majority and the minority.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash):

I move the adoption of the majority report. (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I would like to ask if it is intended to put the word "congresses" in after "conventions" and make it apply to both.

DEL. GAYLORD: In the article on congress it reads that the order of business of the congress shall be prepared by the National Secretary, subject to approval by the congress.

DEL. WORK: I want to ask whether this section applies to congresses as well as conventions.

DEL. GAYLORD: The whole section does not apply.

DEL. WORK: It is intended, is it not, that those whose credentials are sent in advance shall be the permanent organization, without a credentials committee acting on them?

DEL. GAYLORD: The section on congresses reads, "Delegates shall be elected and accredited otherwise as for a nominating convention."

DEL. WORK: I want to move an amendment, to add to the second paragraph, right at the end, "and they shall permanently organize the convention," so there will be no need of any credentials committee before we proceed to the permanent organization of the convention, and so we will not waste a day's time.

DEL. GAYLORD: Doesn't it mean that by the ascertaining of the number of uncontested delegates and the election of officers?

DEL. WORK: I think it virtually does, but it does not say so; that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you accept it?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is no objection to it if the comrades wish it.

DEL. WORK: I was in doubt as to the meaning.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I object to it.

DEL. WORK: I think it is necessary that I myself was in doubt what it meant.

DEL. GAYLORD: Write it out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman has accepted it. The question is on the adoption of the majority report as thus amended. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The motion is carried and the section adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: We are now on Article XII, Section 4:

Section 4. In states and territories in which there is one central organization affiliated with the party, the state or territorial organizations shall have the sole jurisdiction of the members residing within their respective territories, and the sole control of all matters pertaining to the propaganda, organization and financial affairs within such state or territory; their activity shall be confined to their respective organizations, and the National Committee and the sub-committees or officers thereof shall have no right to interfere in such matters without the consent of the respective state or territorial organizations.

The section was adopted without objection.

Section 5 was read, as follows:

5. The state committees shall make monthly reports to the National Secretary concerning their membership, financial condition and general standing of the party.

DEL. GAYLORD: On this there is an objection by Berlyn. He says: "My objection to this article is that the party has no means to enforce the same."

On motion the section was adopted as reported.

Section 6, being the same as in the former constitution, was read as follows:

Section 6. The State Committee shall pay to the National Committee every month a sum equal to five cents for every member in good standing within their respective territories.

Adopted without objection.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I would like to amend that, to make it seven cents instead of five.

The amendment was not seconded.

The next section was read:

Section 7. All state organizations shall provide in their constitutions for the initiative, referendum and imperative mandate.

Adopted without debate.

Section 8 was read:

Section 8. No person shall be nominated or endorsed by any subdivision of the party for candidate

unless he is a member of the party and has been such for at least one year, but this provision shall not apply to organizations which have been in existence for less than one year.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted.

DEL. C. L. FURMAN (N. Y.): I want to make a motion to have in place of No. 8 as follows: "No person shall be nominated or endorsed by any subdivision of the party for candidacy for a political or state party office unless such person has been a member in good standing of the party for at least two consecutive years." (Seconded.)

DEL. POPE, (Mo.): I am opposed to that, and I will tell you why. We are having all over this country more locals being organized. Take my state. Just lately one county has been organized, and they are getting pretty near ready to elect a county ticket. I know it is all right, but I would like to say that they have a hard time to get men suitable. If you require a guaranty of two years, we cannot hope to have in those districts members that can take hold of this thing.

DEL. FELDMAN, (N. Y.): A point of order. This does not apply to locals that do not exist for two years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is not sustained, for the reason that he has got a motion to substitute what he read for what the committee has. That would put this out of business.

DEL. POPE: I want to say further that in a number of places our comrades are going to be prevented from getting candidates. In the great state of Missouri, in the city of St. Louis, we do not have enough members to nominate from the local to furnish candidates even for circuit judges, etc. We have to take mechanics and everybody. I am willing to say I do not care if you keep every lawyer off the ticket, but I will tell you what I don't want you to do; I don't want you to say to the comrades in the rural districts that a man must be a member for two years. The proletariat is going from one place to another.

When they get ready to nominate one man who has been in the party they don't know where he is; he has to have a job, and he is gone, and when they get ready to nominate a man he is gone somewhere else to get work. That is why they go. I save us a chance to get these people for our candidates. Don't go and put a thing in like this.

DEL. ANDERSON, (N. D.): I want to say for the information of this delegation that the Socialist party for the first time put up a Socialist ticket in the city of Devil's Lake this spring, and if this proposition had been the rule, we would not have been able to put a ticket in the field at all, and, consequently, could not have voted. I am opposed to it.

DEL. PORTER, (Nebr.): I move to table the amendment.

The motion was seconded and carried.

DEL. SOLOMON, (N. Y.): Another amendment. I renew Comrade Furman's amendment, with the exception that the clause shall not apply to newly organized locals. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: Organized less than two years?

DEL. FURMAN: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: Organized less than two years?

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to substitute for the section offered by the committee the section offered by Del. Furman, with the exception that this section shall not apply to those locals which have not been organized for two years.

DEL. SOLOMON: Now, it is all right to make an appeal for some locals that are unable to get sufficient comrades to run for the various offices, and we, therefore, are compelled not to place in nomination comrades for the different positions. We have had some experience in New York, and I believe Comrade Furman, who made the main motion, had that particular experience in view. If I am not mistaken about five years' ago we placed in nomination William Brewster, I believe, for attorney general of the state of New York, and while he was a candidate he endorsed the

Democratic party at that time. I say that in a large local which is organized two years, if they cannot find comrades enough to run for the various offices, it is improper to place in nomination a comrade who has just recently become a member of the party, even if they have not enough to represent the party. They will create a great deal of trouble and place the party in a difficult position if elected. It is better not to have anyone elected than to have one elected that will make a laughing stock of the party.

DEL. WOODBY, (Cal.): We have known men who sold out the party, and some of them have been members of locals for years. In my judgment, a man who understands its principles is no more liable to do it after he has been in the party six months than five years. Most of the men who have done that kind of thing, who gave us the most trouble, so far as I recollect, are men that have been in the locals for years, as far as that is concerned, so I don't think a few months either one way or the other, is a matter that will settle this thing. I have known a man being in a local only six months, and even before he came into it he might know more about it than some that have been in six years. It is the personal integrity of the person interested that determines as to what a man will do. The fact that some men might have done that and have not been in the local for over a year is no evidence that some fellow won't do it that has been in more than six years.

DEL. GAYLORD: I wish to read from our constitution in Milwaukee. It seems to me this is a matter for the local and state organizations. Under the old constitution, in Wisconsin we take care of that in the state and local organizations. The constitution in Milwaukee provides that any person that has been a candidate on the ticket for the old parties shall not be endorsed under at least five years.

DEL. AMBROSE, (Mont.): I am opposed to this two-year clause, for the reason that in the western country we have a hard time getting members to serve as delegates to the con-

vention, let alone nominating them for office. We have in the city of Butte a town of 90,000 inhabitants. There have been times in Butte, one year, where we had to put a dead man on the ticket, a man that had been dead for three years, because we had no man that we could put on. (Laughter.)

Now, we go into a convention to nominate, and we have got men in some of the wards there who are in such a position that they cannot accept a nomination because their jobs depend on it. The amalgamated companies have such a control on the town that if a man accepts a nomination on the Socialist ticket it is equivalent to losing his job, and the consequence is that in the first ward we had to go to work and take a dead man, a former member of the local, and put the dead man on the ticket, and the best the Republican (Applause.) We don't want to be restricted. We have a man there in our city that we elected on the Socialist ticket as alderman in the city of Butte and he was a member for two years and eight months in the Socialist party, and in good standing, and as soon as he was elected to office he sold us out, and we put in his undated resignation as we had it, sworn to before a notary public, and the Democrats and Republicans accepted it in the city council and turned around and renominated him. I say one year is sufficient, and let each state take care of its own business, and let the national office take care of that, and if we have got anything to submit to a referendum we can take care of that, too.

DEL. KUNATH, (Ind.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I believe this matter should be left to each state and each local to have the common sense to state the time of membership in the Socialist party. We have a member in Evansville who slipped into membership in the local just long enough to be on the ticket and we nominated him. We put him on the ticket as a candidate, and he turned around and worked for the Democrats. He was two years a member of the Socialist party. Now, I had not been a member of the Socialist party for two years when I was

put up for the office of coroner. I had been just eight days in the Socialist party when I was put on the ticket as a candidate for coroner. I have not turned around and sold out the party. I have been a Socialist since 1866, when Bebel made his first speeches in Germany. When I came to Evansville there was not a Socialist organization, and the Socialist Labor party, I didn't know anything about it, and later on I joined the Populist party, though I didn't stand for their principles exactly and when they fused with the Democrats I had enough. "If you fuse your organizations together I have enough." And so it came about that right after the Democratic party and Populist party fused together we established the Social Democratic party in Evansville. I became a member of that about eight days before the county Convention, and I was put on the ticket for coroner. Did that lead to any corruption or confusion? No. Leave that alone and leave it to the good, common sense of every state and of every local to act according to common sense.

It was moved and seconded to table the amendment.

DEL. SOLOMON: I withdraw the amendment.

The section as reported by the committee was then adopted.

The next section was read:

Section 9. Upon the written statement of five members of the National Executive Committee, and three states that they have good grounds for believing the provisions of this constitution to have been violated by any state organization, the National Executive Committee shall fix a date for the hearing of both sides to the controversy. If, after the hearing, a majority of the National Executive Committee believes the charges to be well founded, it shall transmit the statements of both sides to the party press and to the members of the National Committee. Thereupon the charter of a state may be recalled after a majority of the National Committee so decides and such decision has been ratified by a referendum vote of the party initiated for this purpose by the National Committee.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. BERGER, (Wis.): I want to speak against the adoption of that section.

DEL. STEDMAN, (Ill.): So do I. DEL. BERGER: For the following reasons: It is absolutely contrary in spirit and in execution to the section, Sec. 4, that you have adopted just about five minutes before. Now, what is the sense and the use of adopting state autonomy in one clause, and then open another door and knock it in the head? If you had had this other in, our party would have been split up about five times during the last six years. State autonomy has kept us from interfering in Washington, and having a cleavage all through the country. State autonomy has prevented getting into trouble in Utah, Nebraska, and in a good many other cases. Why not let the comrades settle it themselves? It is entirely unnecessary, and once, when you tried to override state autonomy in the case of Wisconsin you almost got yourselves into trouble. Leave it to the comrades in the respective states. The constitution and the principle of state autonomy has worked well. Please do not try to override it simply by opening new gates and new ways of interference. You will find it will require scientific, uncompromising, clear-cut, revolutionary, and so on—class conscious, I have omitted one—National Committee men who will find fault with almost anything, and you will have troubles continuously. You can find even now they will find fault with everything we have done here. They will find fault with nominations and with the Socialist movement in its tactics, and you will have continuous trouble. We got along so nicely with the principles of the constitution as we had them until now. Don't kill a good thing. I move that this be stricken out.

DEL. STEDMAN: Move to table.

DEL. BERGER: I move that it be tabled.

DEL. STEDMAN: I second the motion to table.

DEL. SLOBODIN: A point of order. A man can't make a speech and make a motion to table.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken.

DEL. STEDMAN: I now move to lay on the table. (Seconded.)

DEL. HERMAN: A point of order. This means to lay the amendment on the table?

DEL. STEDMAN: It means to lay the whole thing on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion to lay on the table say aye. Opposed, no.

A division was called for, and a vote being taken by a show of hands, the motion to lay on the table was carried, 73 in favor, 28 against.

The next section was read, becoming Section 9, instead of 10, as originally numbered:

Section 9. In case of controversy in any state as to the validity of the title of its officers and the question of recognition by the national organization, a referendum of the membership of said state to determine the question may be taken in the following manner:

A call signed by not less than one-third of the total membership of the state in good standing at the time the controversy arose, asking the National Executive Committee to conduct a referendum of the said state membership for the election of officers for the position in dispute shall be filed with the National Secretary.

Upon receiving such call the National Executive Committee shall conduct a referendum of the membership of said state for the election of officers for the position in dispute. All locals appearing on the state list at the national headquarters in good standing at the time the controversy arose shall be privileged to make nominations, and all members in good standing at that time shall be entitled to vote.

DEL. GAYLORD: This is the article that was adopted recently by the referendum.

DEL. SLOBODIN: There is a minority report.

DEL. SOLOMON: I move that this be tabled. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that this section be laid on the table.

DEL. WALDHORST, (Ala.): I want to know whether this article was adopted by a referendum of the party.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. WALDHORST: Then I want it to stay in there.

The motion to lay on the table was lost.

DEL. ROSS, (Okla.): I move the adoption of the majority report, (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the report of the committee be adopted. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. HERMAN, (Wash.): I think Washington at least has a right to be heard on this proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody has got a right to be heard.

DEL. HERMAN: This has afflicted us to some extent. I want to appeal to your common sense. In the state of Washington, under the pretense of getting one-third of the membership in good standing at the time the controversy arose, people have gone out in the state in the name of a temporary committee of the Socialist party and have gotten signatures to petitions, and many of these signatures were of people who were not only not members of the party at the time that the controversy began, but were never members of the party, and I have in my pocket at the present time a resolution from a local in Hamilton, Washington, that I want to read in connection with this, to prove my statement. A copy of this is on file in the national office.

"The members of the local of this place desire to call your attention to some important existing facts regarding the facts of some individuals working in the interest of the temporary committee of the Socialist party of Washington, located in Seattle.

"First: That an attempt was made by fraudulent means and trickery to disrupt and disorganize this local with the ultimate purpose of turning it over to said temporary committee.

"Second: That many signatures have been placed petitioning for a referendum vote to remove the present state committee of the Socialist party of Washington, of persons who

were not members of the Socialist party or of any local. Likewise, those members of Hamilton local who signed said petitions, on having a clearer understanding of the premises, now repudiate and condemn said petition.

"Third: That bulletin No. 3 for March, sent out by the temporary committee, states that they have a local at this place, which, to our knowledge, has no existence.

"Fourth: The work of the temporary committee has been fraudulent, crooked and unreliable, and condemns itself at this place. It is not an exemplary effort and if taken as a criterion of other localities, we condemn it from start to finish. Therefore, we, the undersigned members of Hamilton Local present at this meeting, demand that our names be withdrawn from said petition.

(Signed.) C. W. PIERCE.

Cor. Secretary:  
THOMAS W. THOMPSON, Chairman;  
JOHN B. FLICK,  
B. W. PIERCE,  
W. B. FENN,  
N. JOHNSON,  
E. O. RICHARDSON,  
E. B. FLICK,  
THOMAS BOLAN,  
A. J. WEAVER,  
I. M. JOHNSTON,  
R. L. JOHNSTON."

Now, we have gone to other places in the state of Washington, where similar conditions prevail, and some of the representatives of this same organization went to Aberdeen, Washington, and got members who were expelled from the party because they had voted for candidates nominated by the Republican and Democratic parties; they were expelled from the party, and these people organized, and I doubt not but what their signatures also appear on the petition. They have accepted the signatures of men and women who were not only members at the time the controversy began, but who were never members of the party and perhaps never will be if they first understand Socialism.

Therefore, I say that the same conditions which prevail in the state of Washington will also prevail in your state in case you carry this amend-

ment, and allow a certain element to create trouble within your organization. I therefore move, Comrade Chairman, that this portion be stricken out from the constitution. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: Comrade Herman did not add an iota in favor of striking out this proposition. His experience proves the possibility of protecting a minority and at the same time guaranteeing the right of the majority. He was up before the executive board. All of them were up before the executive board. We investigated the proposition right here last week, and, finding that a number of members there stated to have been in opposition were not there under their signatures and, furthermore, listening to different arguments, we declared that we had no power in the premises under the same rule. So, why strike out a proposition which works beneficially in your own experience, Comrade, right over there? They brought over 700 signatures, but not half of them were in the party at the time this happened, and, therefore, we ruled it out of order, that is all. On the other hand, there is a possibility of a small crowd, a small crowd of politicians—for there are politicians also in the Socialist movement, I find that, and pretty tricky ones—

A DELEGATE: Berger!

DEL. BERGER: No, sir. I will say one thing, comrades, that, of course we know that every organization of necessity is a machine. You will never have an organization that is not a machine, but at the same time you ought to save the rights of minorities, especially in cases where there is fanaticism, ill will, and so on. We are not angels; I haven't seen any angel's wings cropping out here any place, and, least of all, did I see any flapping in Washington when they appeared and told their story, and let me tell you it was the story of a pretty shrewd lot of politicians managing a state. Yet they have an organization and they took the part of the organization, and that is all there is to it. Comrades, minorities ought to be safeguarded or we would have conditions arising like they had in Nebraska, when about five men held

the entire organization of the state of Nebraska; that was about all. Besides, that has been adopted by a referendum about six months ago, and we have no right to set aside a referendum of the party, a general referendum of the party in this convention this year, no right whatsoever. (Applause.) Therefore, comrades, I ask you to vote against the striking out of this part.

DEL. CARR: I do not wish to discuss the question, and as two speeches have been made, and it is perfectly fair to have one on each side, I move that we lay this motion on the table, to strike out. (Seconded.)

DEL. HERMAN: A point of order. According to the rule adopted yesterday the mover of the proposition has the right to speak after the previous question has been ordered.

DEL. CARR: This is not the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN: No previous question has been called for. It is moved and seconded to lay the motion to strike out on the table. Those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it and the motion is carried.

It was moved and seconded that the section be adopted.

DEL. WILLIAMS, (Minn.): Comrade Chairman, I move that the section be amended with these words to follow the end of the last paragraph: "All members in good standing at that time to be entitled to vote, provided, that one or more locals notify the National Secretary within forty-five days that such petition is being circulated protesting against the election of these officers." This will make a prescribed time in which this petition may be filed. We don't want to have to go about a year or six months back, and I think it is best to set a time limit at which to make it good. (Amendment seconded.)

It was moved and seconded to lay the motion to amend on the table. Carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now recurs on the adoption of the report as read. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The motion is carried, and the section is adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: At the bottom of the last column of the report, Sec-

tion 11, of Article XII, as it reads here now becomes Section 10. This has since been approved by a majority of the committee, so it becomes a part of the majority report. I read:

Section 10. The National Executive Committee shall appoint secretaries to reside in the unorganized states, who shall be selected as far as possible from the section in which the state is located. A salary not to exceed \$18.00 a week shall be allowed them, and they shall have complete charge of organization in their respective states. They shall hold office subject to the National Executive Committee, provided that when there are not less than ten locals and 200 members in any state a state organization may be formed, which shall then elect its own officers.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. SOLOMON: I want to amend by adding the following clause: "subject to the approval of the members in those states." (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: May I ask for a point of information.

DEL. SOLOMON: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: How could you have a state organization without having the approval of the members in that state?

DEL. SOLOMON: I take it for granted that this means, I believe, that the national office shall have no right to send a person there as a state organizer when the members of that state are opposed to it.

DEL. GAYLORD: That applies to the first part.

DEL. SOLOMON: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: You did not say so.

DEL. WALDHORST, (Ala.): A point of information. Section 3, of Article XII, minority report, says: "The National Executive Committee may provide in weak or unorganized states, with the consent of the organized Socialists of the state, a State-Secretary Organizer. The committee shall have power to arrange salaries and other details."

Now, there are two of these here. I would like to know whether the committee proposes to introduce Sec-

tion 3, of Article XII, also, or just the one down below Article XII, Section 11, in the minority report?

DEL. SNYDER, (Kan.): I can answer that. We withdrew that in favor of the one read by Comrade Gaylord.

DEL. GAYLORD: It was the arrangement to give a weak state some leeway. It might organize with 200, but if it got below 150 the national office would help it out and take charge.

DEL. WORK: In order to make this correspond with the rest of the constitution it should state there "not less than ten locals or 200 members in good standing," and I so move.

The amendment was seconded and carried.

DEL. WALDHORST: I move to add where it says "reside in the unorganized states," the words "or weak organized states."

DEL. GAYLORD: That comes in the next section.

DEL. WALDHORST: Do you want to adopt that down below?

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes, we propose that also.

DEL. KERR, (Ill.): Along in the second line the word "shall" was, I think, put in by mistake instead of "may," and it makes it mandatory on the committee to appoint secretaries to be selected from the states, which I do not think was intended. I ask the committee to change the "shall" to "may."

DEL. GAYLORD: I will ask how many of the committee here accept that Comrade Slobodin, do you accept it?

DEL. SLOBODIN: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: All right; we accept it.

DEL. O'HARE: A point of information. How many unorganized states are there?

A DELEGATE: Eight.

DEL. MILLER, (Nev.): I am opposed to this whole business. In the first place, if the state is weak, it is an unwarranted interference with the state organization. The provision provides that the National Committee may appoint a secretary, but it does not say where he shall come from.

DEL. GAYLORD: It does provide.

A DELEGATE: I move to correct by striking out the words "to reside" and putting "residing" there.

DEL. GAYLORD: On that point I will say that in an unorganized state we are less likely to find a man who understands the party and its methods who will be capable of taking charge of such an important work as building up a new organization.

A DELEGATE: No carpet baggers.

DEL. OSBORNE, (Cal.): I think since they are interested in bringing this amendment up, that these secretaries and organizers should be appointed in all unorganized states, not may be appointed. They may be appointed now, the national organizers in any state, but the point is, that unless it is mandatory upon the committee to appoint a secretary in each unorganized state. We want to make a change there. Therefore, I oppose the amendment because it is the original proposition introduced by the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the committee accepted the word "may," and it is there. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. OSBORNE: We are voting on the amendment that they may appoint?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, the amendment is to change from the words "to reside" to the word "residing."

The amendment was lost, and the section as read was then adopted.

Del. Gaylord then read Section 11, originally numbered 12, as follows:

Section 11. The National Executive committee is authorized to give financial assistance from the national organization to any state organization applying for same, and having a membership of less than 1,200, to enable the secretary of said state to secure a living wage while giving his entire time to the work of organizing the state.

On motion the section was adopted. The next article, 13, was read:

Section 1. The location of the headquarters of the party shall be determined by the National Committee.

Adopted without discussion.

DEL. GAYLORD: Next, inserting

a new article to be numbered 14:

Section 1. Delegates to the International Congress shall also be elected by a referendum in the year when the congress is held; one delegate for every 5,000 members.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the article.

DEL. SPARGO: I rather object to the limiting of the number of delegates that may be sent by the party under that motion. If they would strike out that clause and amend it so that the number of delegates to be sent should be determined by the National Committee in that year, I think that would cover the situation. As a matter of fact, at the present time we would be permitted to send only eight, whereas it might be advisable to send a larger number, providing we could do it.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: The purpose of this amendment now under consideration is to apply to our delegates across the water the same provision we have applied to delegates to the National Convention; that is, that the organization, as such, shall defray their expenses, and not favor those who can pay their own way. (Applause.) Consequently, I think this should be adopted. If you allow the National Committee to determine, as previously, they may decide on one, according to the finances that we have on hand, or two, and then permit those to have credentials who can pay their own expenses.

DEL. SPARGO: No, no. A point of order.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Then you will wipe that out?

DEL. SPARGO: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: All right, then that is done. But if you adopt the proposition that is now before you, on the present basis of membership, we would elect eight members by referendum, and then we would have to provide the means to send them across the water, and I think that is proper.

DEL. SPARGO: The point I desired to make was as to just that. I think we will all agree that no person should represent the party at an international congress merely because he happens to have money to go on a picnic. That has been done hereto-

fore, and it has not been representative of this party. I think we are also agreed that they should be elected by a referendum, but if we fix now that we must elect one delegate for each 5,000 members, it would mean that we have to elect eight and send them, whether we had the money at the time or not, or whether we were in a campaign when we needed that couple thousand dollars. I say we can very well afford to let the National Committee determine the number, but insist that the election be by a referendum vote.

DEL. BERGER: Coming to think of it, I will have to oppose the amendment of Comrade Spargo. We have an International Congress only once in every three years, and if we should need money we can always issue a special assessment for that purpose. But the expense is not as big as some people imagine. All we need is probably two or three hundred dollars per delegate, not more as a rule. Now, if this great American party is to be represented at all, we ought to have at least one representative for every 5,000 members in good standing. So far we had usually one man there and then everybody who had money could take himself and his wife and his cousin and his grandmother, and then they were representing the proletariat of America. Now, of course, I have nothing against the comrades who are able to go. On the contrary, I was very sorry I could not go. But I don't believe it is the proletarian way. We ought to have representatives representing our party, and we ought not to be stingy on account of a couple hundred dollars for sending them there. I move you that the report as originally read be adopted.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): Just a word. I do not believe that it is either sensible or just to leave it to any committee to determine the basis of representation. It should be done by the party as a whole. (Applause.)

DEL. GAYLORD: If we understand the sense of those who introduced this, it will be as follows: Delegates to the International Congress shall be elected by a referendum vote in the year in which that

congress is held. There shall be one delegate for every 5,000 members, and their expenses shall be paid out of the treasury of the national party. That is the sense.

DEL. WORK: Is it not true that the delegates sent to the International Congress have a right to cast a vote according to the number of members the party has in any country, regardless of the number of delegates that are sent?

DEL. BERGER: So far they were proportioned according to the nation, so and so many voters, and it was a very unjust apportionment, because Bulgaria and Serbia and the United States really had the same apportionment. But I understand that that is going to be changed.

A DELEGATE: It has been changed. It is going to be changed, and then of course we will have a better representation according to our standing. But at the same time, even if it has been changed, eight men can represent us a good deal better than one can, at any rate; and this great party, having about 40,000 dues-paying members, ought not to be represented by one man, but it ought to be represented by at least one man for every 5,000 members.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I think a word of explanation might here be in order. At the Stuttgart Congress there were, I think, eight committees, six or eight important committees. Nearly all the work of the International Congress was done in the committees. The fireworks were on the floor, but they don't have anything to do with what happens; they are absolutely for the benefit of the galleries. The actual work is all done in committee, the actual discussion. There has no way yet been discovered by which one man can serve on eight committees simultaneously and all busy. There are always that many committees. The result of it was that we simply had to divide up this year the best way we could. Of course there were quite a number of people who were, fortunately or unfortunately, according to the way you look at it, who were traveling in Europe incidentally, and I have nothing to say against them; they were very good comrades; we happened to

be very lucky this year, but it was pure luck that this movement happened to be represented well upon the committees.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I think ninety days or four months or five months before the convention is better for the election. I move to amend so as to make it five months.

DEL. GAYLORD: Does Berger accept that? I believe there can be no objection, though I don't see why that election should be held five months before the date of the convention.

DEL. WORK: By the time of the next congress we will have at least 60,000 dues-paying members.

DEL. BERGER: I hope we will have them.

DEL. WORK: That will give us twelve delegates. I think six is enough. I move to have one for every 10,000 members.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I am perfectly willing to pay my five cents to send a delegate, and this proposition to a delegate for every 5,000 members, if I understand Delegate Berger correctly, means that I will have to do without three stogies or one cigar to send that delegate; and I am in favor of the European movement knowing that we have got more than one or two Socialists in this country, and if we could send one hundred delegates and it would cost me no more than five cents to send them, I say let them go. (Applause.)

DEL. KORNIGOLD (Ill.): I have a little amendment to offer. I think the resolution reads that the expenses shall be paid out of the national treasury. I move that they be paid out of the national treasury or by special assessment.

The motion was not seconded. The section as read was then adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: We have Article XV now, originally numbered XIV:

Section 1. This constitution may be amended by a national convention or by a referendum of the party in the manner above provided. But all amendments made by a national convention shall be submitted seriatim to a referendum vote of the party membership.

The article was adopted without objection.

DEL. GAYLORD: One more article, XVI, "Time and method of taking effect." Notice this carefully. I modify this; it was understood in the committee:

Section 1. This constitution shall take effect and be in force on the first day of January after the time of its approval by a national referendum of the party membership.

DEL. WORK: This is not a constitution. It is simply a proposal of some amendments to the old constitution. The old constitution is still in effect and will remain in effect until this is adopted or until next January.

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes; that is, the old constitution.

DEL. WORK: Therefore it should be that "these amendments shall take effect" and so on. So I move to strike out the words "this constitution" and substitute "these amendments."

The amendment was not seconded. THE CHAIRMAN: The question now is upon the adoption of the constitution as a whole.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: It says: "This constitution shall take effect on the first day of January after its adoption by referendum." Apply that to what is before us. Suppose in two months this will be adopted by referendum; it means this, that it only takes effect the first of next January, while in here you have provided that the National Executive Committee and National Secretary and other officers shall be nominated in November. It would mean then that until November, 1909, there would be no nominations.

DEL. GAYLORD: And no constitution, either.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Oh, yes; the first of January it would be a constitution.

DEL. INGALLS (Minn.): I move to amend by striking out "shall take effect from and after its adoption by referendum." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that was adopted.

DEL. INGALLS: No.

DEL. WALDHORST: I move a

reconsideration of the previous motion. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded to reconsider the last vote on the last section so as to open it up again.

DELEGATES: It was not adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: By common consent, then, it was not adopted.

DEL. WALDHORST: I move to amend by inserting in that a provision that "this constitution shall take effect on and after its adoption by referendum." (Seconded.)

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): A point of information. I would like to ask the convention and also the National Secretary if it is not a fact that the old constitution stands in effect until this organization adopts a new one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. BERGER: A point of information. Does that mean that we will have to go to work immediately and elect a new National Executive Board?

DEL. INGALLS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should think it would mean that if this constitutional provision in regard to the matter is adopted by the membership, then we would have to proceed.

DEL. GAYLORD: We considered this; we are just on the eve of a national campaign. It will be trouble enough to get the referendum, and it might disturb our organization at present and our methods. Our affairs have been planned before this convention, and to change them between now and election day will disorganize things. Let this new constitution wait till the first of January. There is only one reason for passing that, and that is this, to get the new methods of organization in the states as provided for here. There need be no question whatever that the present Executive Committee and present National Committee will get at once in correspondence with them even before this is adopted by referendum, because they see the sense of this convention and they will move in that direction as soon as it is adopted by the referendum. The present Executive Committee and National Committee will aim to carry it out so far as possible even before the first of January.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question

now recurs on the amendment offered by Del. Ingalls of Minnesota, providing that this shall go into effect as soon as it has been adopted by the referendum.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I offer an amendment, "with the exception of the officers of the party, in which case it shall not go into effect until the new year." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to amend the amendment offered by Comrade Ingalls so as to provide that this shall apply except to the officers, who shall hold over until the first of January next. Are you ready for the question on the amendment offered by Del. Goebel?

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I offer a substitute for both. I move to lay them on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was seconded and carried.

The section was then adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is a section which was wanted to be drafted by common consent, with reference to trustees. This will go in under the "National Committee." I should say, or the article on "Management," Article III.

DEL. STEDMAN: Comrade Gaylord, I make a suggestion that be referred to the National Executive Committee, so that they will revise it afterward.

DEL. GAYLORD: I will read this suggestion of a new section for this constitution:

Section . The National Executive Committee shall elect three trustees in whom the title of all property of the National Committee shall be invested, who shall have the supervision of all title of property. Such trustees shall have authority to accept service for the party, and shall be the obligors in all bonds. All official bonds shall run to such trustees and the National Committee.

DEL. STEDMAN: I do not think it is necessary to explain at length. It is simply so that when bequests are made to the party some person will be in a position to receive them. For instance, a man died some time ago out west and left property to the party. There was no one in the legal sense of the term who could take it, and consequently his will was not carried out at all. Such a party should be designated. Again, a bond made out to the

party is valueless, because in order to act on it you must have to join every single member of the party as plaintiff.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move to amend, that the Committee on Constitution be empowered to insert the necessary legal provisions which will safeguard the funds of the party; because we are in doubt as to whether the provision presented will fulfill that requirement. (Seconded.)

DEL. STEDMAN: I call Comrade Morgan's attention to the fact that this committee will be out of existence when the time comes.

DEL. MORGAN: I am willing to change the committee from the Constitution Committee to the National Executive Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now recurs on the proposition offered by Comrade Morgan to refer to the National Executive Committee. All those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. Carried. The question is referred to the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERGER: I move you that we adopt now the constitution as a whole. (Seconded.)

DEL. FARRELL: I want a word for the constitution. I think I have something that might interest a great many in this convention, and it is in reference to the traveling expenses of the delegates. I wanted to bring it up before and was denied that right. I want the expenses of the delegates paid from the National treasury. I want a reconsideration of the action. I can't make it; some comrade who voted in the affirmative must make the motion that is suitable. The section, as I would amend it, would read: "Section 5. Railroad fare for the delegates going to and coming from conventions shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by setting aside ten per cent of the national dues for this purpose." This is the addition: "Such funds failing to bear the actual expenses of delegates, the National Committee together with the National Secretary shall have the power to raise the balance required by special assessment or special per capita assessment." DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I move a reconsideration. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded to reconsider the action which the convention took with reference to this particular section. All in favor of reconsideration say aye. Opposed, no. The noes have it and the motion is lost. The action now recurs on the adoption of the constitution as a whole as amended.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): I rise to make an amendment, if in order. My amendment is to strike out Section 10 of Article XII.

THE CHAIRMAN: I rule this motion out of order on the ground that we have already taken action upon it and defeated it, and you cannot do it again. It is moved and seconded that the report of the Constitution Committee be adopted as a whole and sent to a referendum, as amended. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. It is carried.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON WOMEN AND THEIR RELATION TO THE SOCIALIST PARTY.

DEL. MILA TUPPER MAYNARD (reporting for the committee): In order to avoid misunderstanding, it is well to make a few statements prior to the reading of the report of the committee. Many requests came from delegates and members of the party for a pronounced expression on the suffrage question. No one doubted the position of the party. It was only that it seemed best to make it more emphatic that it is a part of the activity of the organization to promote the suffrage movement.

The Platform Committee took as positive action as the Women's Committee felt it could ask; therefore, they regard nothing further on that question as necessary. This is the language of the declaration of principles, "Unrestricted equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction." That, we contend, is all that can possibly be asked of the organization. So we introduce nothing further relative to suffrage.

Our main proposition has to do with a specific effort to increase and make more effective the agitation and propaganda and organization among women. Now, this must not be confused with outside efforts at propaganda. All that

the report of the committee has to do with is efforts within the party, by the party, and for the party. I make this statement in order that you may not confuse the report of the committee with possible activities outside of the party. This we may welcome, but as an organization we have nothing to do with that line of activity. Now for the specific report of the committee.

#### MAJORITY REPORT OF WOMEN'S COMMITTEE.

"The National Committee of the Socialist Party has already provided for a special organizer and lecturer to work for equal, civil and political rights in connection with the Socialist propaganda among women, and their organization in the Socialist party.

"This direct effort to secure the suffrage to women increases the party membership and opens up a field of work entirely new in the American Socialist party. That it has with it great possibilities and value for the party, our comrades in Germany, Finland and other countries have abundantly demonstrated.

"The work of organization among women is much broader and more far-reaching than the mere arrangement of tours for speakers. It should consist of investigation and education among women and children, particularly those in the ranks in or out of labor unions and to the publication of books, pamphlets and leaflets, especially adapted to this field of activity.

"To plan such activity requires experience that comes from direct contact with and absorbing interest in the distinct feature of woman's economic and social conditions, and the problems arising therefrom.

"For this reason, the committee heretofore requests this convention to take definite action on this hitherto neglected question. We ask that it make provision to assist the Socialist women of the party in explaining and stimulating the growing interest in Socialism among women, and to aid the women comrades in their efforts to bring the message of Socialism to the children of the proletariat we recommend the following:

"1st. That a special committee of five be elected to care for and manage the work of organization among women.

"2nd. That sufficient funds be sup-

plied by the party to that committee to maintain a woman organizer constantly in the field as needs may.

"3rd. That this committee co-operate directly with the national headquarters and be under the supervision of the national party.

"4th. That this committee be elected by this national convention, its members to consist not necessarily of delegates to this convention.

"5th. That all other monies needed to carry on the work of the woman's committee outside of the maintenance of the special organizer, be raised by the committee.

"6th. That during the campaign of 1908 the woman appointed as organizer be employed in states now possessing the franchise.

MILA TUPPER MAYNARD,  
WINNIE E. BRANSTETTER,  
JOSEPHINE R. COLE,  
GRACE BREWER,  
M. T. BREWSTER,  
SOL FIELDMAN,  
ANTOINETTE KONIKOW,  
GERTRUDE BRESLAU HUNT,  
DEL. GROESBECK (Wyo.): As the representative of a jurisdiction both territorial and state, that has recognized women for thirty-eight years, the state of Wyoming, where woman suffrage is an accomplished fact and recognized by all parties, I take pleasure, as one of the delegates coming from that state, the pioneer state of woman suffrage, in moving the adoption of the report of this committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. MAYNARD: You anticipated my statement that one member of the committee desires to make a minority report, Comrade Payne of Texas.

DEL. LAURA B. PAYNE (Tex.): Comrades, a committee was appointed to ascertain what relation the women bear to the Socialist movement. That was the way the question was stated here, and that was the idea I had of it; and I was surprised that they brought up any such questions as are contained in the majority report, and I was surprised that they appointed me on the committee, for on the committee I seemed to be the only dissenting voice. I may be wrong, but I am going to read my minority report, with your consent, and you can do with it what you please. But I want to say to you now that I hope you will consider this thing clearly before you adopt the majority report,



for it contains more disasters to our movement than you have imagined.

#### MINORITY REPORT OF WOMEN'S COMMITTEE.

"The Socialist movement is the political expression of the working class regardless of sex, and its platform and program furnish ample opportunity for propaganda work both by and among men and women when we are ready to take advantage of it. The same blow necessary to strike the chains from the hands of the working man will also strike them from the hands of the working woman.

"Industrial development and the private ownership and control of the means production and distribution of wealth have forced women and children into the mills and factories, mines, workshops and fields along with the men, dependent for job and wage on the master class. Into that mart of trade they go to sell their labor power, and when for no reason whatever they cannot find a market for it, they must seek other means of support. Driven to the last resort, men often become criminals or vagabonds, while women, for food, clothing and shelter, sell themselves and go to recruit the ranks of the fallen.

"Whether it be economic slavery to this extent—or whether it be within the bounds of the possibility of an honorable life—the cause is the same, namely, the private ownership of the means by which they must live.

"It is contended by some that women because of their disfranchisement and because of their economic dependence on men, bear a different relationship to the Socialist movement from that of the men. That is not so. The economic dependence of our women and children—whether to a greater or less extent—can be traced to the same cause, which Socialism will alone remove."

DEL. PAYNE (pausing in the reading): Now, I wish to say right here, because of what was said by our comrade in moving the adoption of the majority report it was explained here that we would not raise the question of woman suffrage, but that question was raised all along in the discussions in our committee; and in my report, which I think is the correct report regarding the question up for discussion, I think that that comrade in and you cannot discuss this question without it. As the women

are discussing it everywhere, I think since we have brought it upon the floor of this convention the best thing to do is to get a correct understanding of it now, and that is the point we don't want to leave out.

(The reading of the report was resumed.)

"In regard to the ballot in some of our states the men are disfranchised, or practically so, by property qualifications and other requirements for voting, and it seems to this committee that you would just as well waste time in trying to regulate those things as in waging a special suffrage campaign for women at this time."

DEL. PAYNE: That discussion came up in committee while we were discussing these things.

(Report continued.)

"There is one thing and one thing only that will remove the evils and that is Socialism, and the nearest way to it is to concentrate all our efforts—men and women working together side by side in the different states and locals, with an eye single to the main issue, The Class Struggle.

"Therefore, my comrades of this convention, I respectfully submit the following resolution:

"Resolved, That there be a special effort on the part of the speakers and organizers in the Socialist party of America to interest the women and induce them to work in the localities of their respective states, side by side with the men as provided in our platform, and constitution, and, be it further

"Resolved, That great care shall be taken not to discriminate between men and women or take any steps which would result in a waste of energy and perhaps in a separate woman's movement."

"Respectfully submitted,

"LAURA B. PAYNE."

DEL. BRAWLEY (Ohio): I move the adoption of the minority report. (Seconded.)

DEL. KONIKOW (Mass.): For the majority report, I would like you to give attention and understand this minority report in the right way. We divided the report into three parts. The first part was a general statement that the majority of the committee should accept a general statement about women taking some position in the party, and that the economic condition of women

will be solved only with the coming of Socialism. No one disputes that, and we accepted it fully.

The second part is a statement of great importance. It commits the party to an entirely new policy which really would demand a reconsideration of the statements and declaration of principles already adopted in our platform. The party has accepted in the general declaration of principles the following: "Unrestricted equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction." Now, the minority report opposes that statement; I do not know whether you realize it. The minority report really states that no special effort in the direction of woman suffrage should be taken at the present time. The minority report states that women cannot get the suffrage until Socialism will be a reality. Now, Comrade Payne takes the stand that there is no use for us Socialists to do anything in the direction of woman suffrage; that woman suffrage will only come with Socialism, and therefore that we should concentrate all our effort only upon the realization of Socialism and pay no attention at all to the demands of hundreds and hundreds of women to do something now if possible for the sake of the suffrage. Now, comrades, I am afraid you may be caught by some general phrases in the minority report which are of no importance at all, because those general phrases cover our point. I want you to understand the real important point of the difference between Comrade Payne and us. It is, do we intend to do something for woman suffrage, or do we intend to wait until Socialism comes? If you accept the minority report, it means that we decide to do nothing at all for woman suffrage; that is, that we will wait till Socialism shall be realized. Now, I, in the name of hundreds and hundreds and thousands of women, protest against such a position for the Socialist party. If you want to get the women interested in the party you should do something for us today and give us a chance to work for woman suffrage, just as you decide to work for the suffrage of men now. Give all the same rights. I am afraid you do not understand the Payne minority report, and I ask Comrade Payne if I do not state everything right.

DEL. PAYNE: That is one of the main things.

DEL. KONIKOW: That is one of the main things. You see that the minority report means no woman suffrage until Socialism has come to be a real thing. If you assume to adopt the minority report with such things, adopt it, but you will not have the sympathy of the women workers with you.

The third part of it is that part in which Comrade Payne appeals that nothing should be done for woman, that woman is in the same condition as man, and that we should do the same old way we have done until now, just go ahead in the same old way of neglecting the work until this time. I am afraid Comrade Bawley, who moved to adopt the minority report, was confused by the phrases, because I cannot believe any comrade should not realize that it is time to do something for women, and inasmuch as we have appointed a committee on the Farmers' Program, and appointed a committee on the union question and committees on many other questions—that it is at least time that we should pay enough attention to work among women to give them a chance to do something in that direction. Any one who listened to the report of the majority will understand that, for we thought it over carefully. We decided to have a committee of five under the direction of the National Committee. We ask you to have women on the committee, but I would be willing to have men on too, but we want on that committee only comrades who really have an interest in that work and will have some concern in that work, just as we have on other committees. When you selected the Farmers' Committee you wanted to select farmers. When you selected the Committee on Labor Organizations you selected a committee who were experienced and interested, and so we should have a committee of people who have had experience in the same line of work.

DEL. MAY WOOD SIMONS (Ill.): Eleven years ago, when I was new in the work in the Socialist movement and had had little experience, I might have taken the position that is taken by the minority report. Today, when I realize that the Socialist movement, if it is to amount to anything, must deal with conditions as they are today, I know

that we cannot ignore the question of how to carry on the propaganda among women. (Applause.) If you will recall, our comrade across the ocean, Keir Hardie, when the proposition was put to him, made the statement that while Socialism came first for the working class, first for the men in the working class, that suffrage was an all important question for the women, and that therefore, then to leave it to the Socialist party did not endorse the suffrage for women. Now, your majority report simply asks that the question of suffrage for women shall be emphasized. It does not ask for any separate organization. If any one comes before this convention and says that the economic condition of men and women is identical, I must say that that person has had little experience in conditions as they actually are. (Applause.) Now, I ask you this afternoon to adopt the report of the majority of the committee.

You cannot ignore this question any longer, and I believe that if you go out of this convention hall having ignored it, you will have put yourselves on record as not having any appreciation for all the work that has been done across the water by our comrades in Europe. They are recognizing this. In Finland and in other countries of Europe have received—or rather those in Finland have received—the ballot, and they are more efficient workers in the Socialist party than they were before.

Now, the only thing I want to say is that I believe women and the men who have formulated the majority report have seen years of experience in the Socialist movement, and they know that we must have a definite plan of propaganda among women.

A motion to lay the minority report on the table was lost.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I want to discuss the majority report. To begin with, I want to emphasize the statements made by Comrade Konikow and Comrade Simons, for we thoroughly agree with the preamble of the minority report. But I do not think it necessary for us to define the relation of men to women and of women to men. We believe that we understand that relation. We do not believe that the Socialist movement needs to waste its energy in order to define that relation. We understand that the only difference between

men and women in America is that men have got votes and the women have not, and therefore it is necessary that we should make a special effort, particularly as a working class movement, as a Socialist movement—we must make a special effort to secure the vote for women now under the capitalist system and the same right that men now enjoy. (Applause.) Therefore, while we recognize the principles that are expressed in that minority report, we do not agree with the stand that the reporter of the minority report has taken. Let me show you the stand that the comrade has taken.

From the very first day of the very first until the very last meeting of that committee, Comrade Payne did not make one motion; Comrade Payne did not submit a single motion; Comrade Payne did not amend a motion; Comrade Payne did not object to anything that we did in the shape of constructive work. Comrade Payne simply said, "I am going to bring in a minority report," it was a minority report, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. We have accepted the nomination on the committee in order to do the work of the committee, in order to bring in a constructive program to this convention and to the Socialist party of America. We did not accept, any of us outside of Comrade Payne, the nomination that was offered to us, in order to block the work that the committee was elected for the purpose of accomplishing. It was the business of Comrade Payne that committee to advise that committee and assist in its work by her work and her vote, but that that Comrade Payne did was to say, "I shall bring in a minority report." Comrade Payne is a brilliant person, and—

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): A point of order. He is not discussing the minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is well taken.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I agree that the chairman has ruled correctly, because the chairman did not understand the spirit in which I offered this criticism. There is no person in this convention that admires the brilliancy and the ability of Comrade Payne any more, perhaps not as much as I do. I am not saying this in order to attack Comrade Payne. My point is that our business was to do real work, and that is what the committee did. The committee recognizes the necessity of not only declaring for these

things that we need, but of organizing so that the things that Comrade Payne stands for herself might be carried out. We know that because the Socialist movement, in addition to being a revolutionary movement, is first of all a political movement; that without being political it cannot carry out its revolutionary program; and because the women have no political and civic rights, therefore, the Socialist movement in America has elected women on the committee. That is why we have them, and we ask them that they shall not neglect the work that the men in the party have neglected. (Applause.) Del. Payne took the floor.

DEL. GOEBEL: If you give her the last speech I move the previous question. (Carried.)

DEL. PAYNE: I want to say one word in starting. Comrade Fieldman says that when we met in our committee meeting, I was the dissenting voice in the report. I did not accept any part of it, and when he undertook to explain my reasons I forgot I was a woman and forgot everything else but one thing for which I am striving and for which we are all striving, and that is the emancipation of the working class.

I deny this everlasting nonsense about trying to organize the women in the Socialist movement. You seem to think, some of you, that the one who brought in the minority report has had no experience in the work. I dislike to refer to my own work, but for the last three years I have been constantly in the field. I do not speak only once or twice a week, but every night, and I speak to both men and women, and I have no time to do separate work for women, and I never say anything about it being a woman suffrage movement, nor do I want anything separate for women.

In regard to that committee that they have advised be appointed, we already have them because we have a National Committee and also a National Executive Committee, and what is the use of any more committees? And as my Comrade Fieldman says, there is no difference in condition between men and women, I agree with him that there is not, and so what is the use of all this discussion?

I want to say this much on the subject of the woman suffrage movement. We have had a woman suffrage movement in this country for years, but

we have not done much. In the states where they have woman suffrage they still have capitalism and they always will have capitalism. If we could have woman suffrage in this country I would be glad to get it. I wish women had the ballot, but since they haven't got it, by the time that we do get it with all the efforts we would make in a campaign for woman suffrage, the great system of capitalism which is already going to pieces and is falling by its own weight, would have been swept away.

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): A point of order, that the comrade speaking is not talking on our report or presenting a proper minority report, but is talking on a plank in the platform already accepted by this convention, a plank in the platform which declares that we shall take immediate steps to gain the suffrage for women. She is not presenting a proper minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot see that that is a point of order.

DEL. PAYNE (resuming): I agree that if woman suffrage would do any good or avail under present conditions I would say, let us have it. But you know it would not do any good. It would do very little good under capitalism if we had it, and I know from every reasonable standpoint we would never get woman suffrage under capitalism. (Applause.) Sometimes I find where they understand just a little about Socialism, they talk about the Socialist suffrage movement. It always makes me sick. Sometimes when I go to cities to discuss Socialism I find the women gathering around in parlors and having these little pink teas. I believe in going among the ranks of the women workers anywhere and everywhere. I admire the Wisconsin people, for they have got grand leaders. They are educators. They distribute literature and educate the people, and that is the thing to do. If the Socialist movement is not to educate the people as to class consciousness, then what in the name of common sense is it for? Let us join the woman suffrage movement and whoop her up for a woman suffrage movement. (Applause.)

DEL. HANFORD: A question of information. I would like to inquire of the speaker who has just closed if it is not a fact that in every country on earth where the working man is disfranchised,

we have to make a struggle for the ballot?

DELEGATES: Sure.

A DELEGATE: A point of information. The working men are being disfranchised in this country. Let them make a struggle here.

The question was then put on the adoption of the minority report by show of hands, and resulted 35 for, 70 against; so the minority report was rejected.

DEL. McDEVITT: I move the previous question on the majority report. (Seconded. Carried.)

DEL. MAYNARD: I will not take your time in this convention, since it is rather late. It would seem from some of the discussion so far that some of you had no idea what you were doing. As a matter of fact, we have already settled, both by vote of the National Committee prior to the convention and by the action of the Platform Committee and in your convention by your adoption of its report, that the Socialists of America are committed to the enfranchisement of women in the same positive, unequivocal manner that the international movement is committed to the suffrage of all people. That much is settled. We do not intend to re-open the question. All that we have provided for is a means by which you can increase the propaganda of our principles among women; these principles to be both the political and social, and the general principles of Socialism and the general matters of organization. It also provides that this be done by a committee, this committee to give attention to children the same as to women.

One word as to the principle involved. The question is, shall we devote ourselves to congratulating ourselves on how logical we are, how finely we can pronounce a priori statements of theory, no matter how they will work. If we can only prove ourselves logical Marxians, then practical programs may be ignored, and the enfranchisement of women will be as though it did not exist, and then we may fold our hands as if we were in the library or the academy and be perfectly content. The position of this party at this convention, I am thankful to say, is that we are outlining a definite program, and a program that you all know ought to be fulfilled, and the reason why we can hope to fulfill it as no other party can, is because our demand for all these things and our de-

mand for the suffrage is backed up by a working class party that knows what it wants and has the power to enforce it.

All these matters that you call in a way opportunism are virtually practical ways of reaching our end. And they would be futile, they would be useless as we know only too well where reforms have proved to be utterly nothing and worse than nothing, were it not that they are backed by a revolutionary party that can enforce its demands by its whole organization, by the whole philosophy of a party that means victory in the end. We are not asking that the old theoretical arguments for suffrage shall go on interminably, but that by the power of the working class the great half of the working class shall be put on an equality in political power with their brothers. (Applause.)

The motion was then put on the adoption of the majority report, and it was adopted.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): A word as to the question of the woman's committee. I move the following resolution: "Resolved, That the Woman's Committee report annually to and its members may be removed or vacancies filled by the National Committee." (Seconded. Carried.)

The convention then elected the Woman's Committee as follows: May Wood Simons, Antoinette Konikow, Winnie E. Branstetter, Meta Stein and Marguerite Prevey.

#### PRINTING OF TRADE UNION RESOLUTION.

DEL. FARRELL: I want to make a motion. Being interested in our organized trade union movement, I do not think this action was taken yet and it was not my privilege at the time the matter was adopted. I move that the convention instruct the National Secretary to have the trade union resolution printed for distribution among organized labor.

The motion was seconded and carried.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRESS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Press is the next order of business. We will now listen to the report of the Committee on Press.

Del. May Wood Simons, chairman of the Committee on Press, then presented the report as follows:

Your Committee on Press respectfully submits the following report:

We recommend that this plate service heretofore established be continued indefinitely under direction of the national office, and, if possible, strengthened and improved, and that locals and individuals be urged to make special efforts during the coming campaign to pay for and secure the publication of this service in all possible newspapers of their respective communities.

Your committee recognizes that the labor and Socialist press of the country is oftentimes at great disadvantage in securing reliable information on matters pertaining to industrial and political affairs, such as strikes, labor trials, injunctions, and especially the sessions of congress at Washington; and it is hereby recommended that the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party take steps to establish an associated Socialist press service which will provide competent correspondents where it seems to be necessary.

It is recommended that this service be paid for by the papers using the same in proportion to the service rendered; and it is believed that a small sum per week from each paper would be sufficient to meet the service self-sustainingly.

Complaint has been received that our state secretaries are harassed by requests from private solicitors for lists of local organizations, to be used for circularizing or other advertising purposes. It is suggested by this committee that all state secretaries thus harassed refuse the lists and request such solicitors to advertise their business in the Socialist press and reach the Socialist membership in that manner.

As a supplementary report, the Press Committee respectfully submits the following resolution:

Whereas, Since the last convention, there has been established at Chicago a daily Socialist newspaper, named the Chicago Daily Socialist; and,

Whereas, The said paper is owned and controlled by the Workers' Publishing Company, composed of individuals and Socialists and trade union locals; and,

Whereas, The said paper has already, in the brief period of its existence, proved itself of inestimable advantage to the party and to many of the editors of the Socialist weekly papers, in furnishing them with prompt and accurate daily accounts of happenings of

importance to the Socialist party; therefore, be it.

Resolved, by this convention that the party be congratulated upon this addition to its propaganda, and that the Socialist locals and party members be urged to assist the Chicago Daily Socialist, financially and otherwise, to the end that it may grow and flourish and be an encouragement to the Socialists of other cities to emulate this splendid effort.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the report.

DEL. BRADFORD (Cal.): I wish to move an amendment, that where the Chicago Daily Socialist is mentioned the New York Daily Call be included. (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK: I am not exactly clear about the meaning of the first paragraph there about establishing a news service of some kind.

DEL. JACOBS (Wis.): For the committee I will say that we discussed this matter in the New York paper, and the committee was just as favorable to that paper as to any other, but that paper is not yet established, and you will find that the reading of the last line there will cover that point, that we encourage the establishment of other papers. Because of the fact that that paper is not yet absolutely established, we did not feel justified in mentioning it. I hope you will understand.

DEL. HERMAN: I would like to inquire of one of the New York delegates, if it is not established, when the New York Daily Call will appear?

DEL. PAULITSCH: The 30th of May.

DEL. HERMAN: It is not established?

DEL. PAULITSCH: It comes out then.

DEL. KORNIGOLD: I do not understand how we possibly can speak of a paper that has not yet appeared, in high terms and give it all kinds of compliments on something when it has done yet absolutely nothing because it has not yet appeared. How can we possibly recommend such a publication and compliment it on its splendid work? It would simply make it nonsensical. Not that we do not wish all kinds of luck to the New York Call, but I think the amendment is entirely out of order.

DEL. PAULITSCH: I will say that when the Daily Call appears on the scene

it will speak so well for itself that it probably will not need this endorsement.

DEL. BRADFORD: I think it does not make nonsense. It is practically established, and it seems to me it would be better to include both of them.

The motion on the amendment was lost. The motion to adopt the report was then put and carried.

DEL. BOOMER: Wouldn't it be in order, to follow out the report just made, to appoint a committee to carry out the provisions of the Press Committee's report?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is referred to the Executive Committee.

DEL. BOOMER: I didn't understand it that way.

#### REPORT OF AUDITING COMMITTEE.

The following report of the Auditing Committee was read:

Your committee begs to report that it finds the cash on hand in the National Secretary's office as follows:

Balance cash in bank.....	\$6,758.33
Balance cash in office.....	418.65
Checks, money orders, etc.....	424.48

Total .....\$7,601.46

We find that accounts have been audited by the Auditing Committee of the National Executive Committee up to May 8th, inst., and we concur in the report of that committee.

Your committee has audited the books and accounts to May 12th, which includes the amounts which have been paid to the delegates for mileage to the National Convention up to that date.

Your committee recommends that the amount charged against Oklahoma, amounting to \$18.50, as per the National Secretary's report, be charged off. It appears that the state never received the stamps for this amount, and that it was lost or misappropriated by the State Secretary acting at that time, and was never received at that time. Office, nor were stamps issued therefor. The party, both state and national, lost the money, one furnishing nothing, and the other receiving nothing.

In reference to the additional amounts appearing on the National Secretary's report, due the National Office for dues stamps, which, including the Oklahoma claim as above,

amount to \$604.96, we recommend that the National Executive Committee cancel such accounts as in their opinion are warranted, or which in their judgment are uncollectible, and charge same to profit and loss account. As all purchases of dues stamps are now for cash, a repetition of this cannot occur.

We are pleased to note that the National Secretary, in concurrence with the suggestion of the Auditing Committee of the National Executive Committee, now deposits the funds in the bank in the name of the office instead of in the name of the individual secretary as heretofore, and we have verified this by inquiry at the Western Trust and Savings Bank.

In conclusion your Committee wishes to congratulate the National Secretary and his assistants on the accuracy, neatness and completeness of their accounts and books.

(Signed)

MARK PEISER,  
DANIEL KISSAM YOUNG,  
WM. L. GARVER,  
W. W. BUCHANAN,  
GEO. E. BOOMER.

Auditing Committee.

On motion of Del. Pope, the report of the Auditing Committee was adopted.

#### REPORT OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

DEL. GERBER (reporting for the Ways and Means Committee): We do not think it possible to outline a definite program that would meet the wants of all sections of the country. The conditions, circumstances and demands of the movement in the cities, on the farms, on the railroads and in the mines are so diverse that we regard it as practically impossible to lay down any ironclad rule that would apply with any degree of satisfaction to the various sections and industries. In the main, the questions of propaganda, education, organization and agitation must be left to the various states and municipalities to be worked out in detail in accordance with their special needs.

It may be suggested, however, as a rule, that all localities should urge the move along the line of agitation and organization. In the matter of agitation there are two powerful agencies both of which should be utilized to the full extent,

literature and public speaking. We urge upon the comrades everywhere the importance of securing subscribers to the Socialist papers, and the sale of Socialist pamphlets and books. Again, Socialist lectures have started thousands to thinking and working for their deliverance from the thralldom of capitalism who could not have been induced to read the printed page. Any means is to be recommended, whether in the form of periodical, book, lecture, drama or song, which will awaken the minds of the masses to the cause and cure of their economic ills. It is only a question of getting the masses to think. Observation has demonstrated that any people will accept Socialism as fast as they are made to understand it. An educated people will no longer remain in slavery.

As to the matter of the raising of funds for campaign and similar purposes, the committee has the following to recommend:

1. We recommend the approval of the action of the National Committee that the National Secretary issue subscription lists, same to be sent direct to the locals by the National Secretary (he to send a statement of the lists sent to the locals to the state secretaries), returns to be made by the locals to the state secretaries who shall remit to the headquarters. Fifty per cent of the collections on these lists to remain with the locals, 30 per cent to go to the state committees and 20 per cent to national headquarters.

We further recommend that state committees and locals circulate none but the subscription lists coming from national headquarters.

2. We recommend that the National Executive Committee get out campaign buttons, medallions and pictures of the candidates of the party for President and Vice President, same to be sold to the locals, state committees and national headquarters. The proceeds to go to the campaign fund.

We recommend that the state committees and locals buy such buttons, medallions and pictures from national headquarters only. That the National Secretary issue a circular-letter to the locals and state committees and through the Party Press to all party members and sympathizers not to buy any such buttons, medallions or pictures from any other source than the national headquarters.

3. That the National Secretary send a circular-letter to all labor organizations in the country setting forth the stand the party has taken whenever the labor organizations were engaged in a fight with their employers and why the labor organizations should support the Socialist party financially and otherwise, this letter to end with an appeal for financial assistance.

4. That posters with the pictures of the presidential candidates be printed by the national office giving the time and place where either of the two candidates will speak, such posters to be used in advertising meetings where candidates are to speak.

5. That in the year when a convention is to be held, an assessment of 5 cents per member be levied quarterly on all members of the party, such income to be used to defray the railroad fare of the delegates to the convention.

6. That the National Secretary continue the use of the coupon book system for the purpose of raising funds for campaign purposes.

7. We recommend the adoption of the minority report of the constitution committee on section 3, article XII, of the constitution.

8. That the National Executive Committee and the National Secretary send a companion along with our candidates for President and Vice President when they are sent out on their campaign tour.

9. That state committees and locals co-operate with the national office to make the ensuing campaign a success, and that all state committees and locals are requested to get their literature and their speakers from national headquarters as much as possible.

In conclusion, your committee has the following to say: We do not think it possible to outline a definite program that would meet the wants of the movement in the varied and widely separated sections of the country. The conditions, circumstances and demands of the movement as found in the cities, on the farms, on the railroads, in the mines, etc., are so diverse, that we regard it as practically impossible to lay down any ironclad rules that would apply with any degree of satisfaction to the various sections, localities and industries.

In the main, questions of propaganda, education, organization and agitation must be left to the various states and municipalities to be worked out in de-

tail in connection with their special needs.

It may be suggested, however, as a rule, that in no locality should the comrades confine their efforts to any one method along the line of agitation, organization or finance. In the matter of agitation there are two powerful agencies both of which should be utilized to the fullest extent; viz., literature and the public speaker. We urge upon the comrades everywhere the importance of securing subscription to good Socialist papers, and the distribution of Socialist leaflets, pamphlets and books. Again, the Socialist lecture platform has started thousands to thinking of, and working for their deliverance from the thrall of capitalism who could not be previously induced to read the printed page. Any method is to be commended, whether in the form of periodical, book, lecture, drama or song, that will awaken the minds of the masses to the cause and cure of their economic ills.

It is only a question of getting the message to the people. Observation has demonstrated that the common people are accepting Socialism practically as fast as they are made to understand it. An educated people will not long remain an enslaved people.

Fraternally submitted,  
(Signed)

M. A. SMITH, Chairman,  
JULIUS GERBER, Sec'y,  
HARRIET D'ORSAY,  
G. W. DAVIS,  
THOMAS L. BUIE,  
CHARLES SANDBURG,  
W. M. BRANDT,  
Committee on Ways and Means.

It was moved to adopt the report of the Committee on Ways and Means.

On motion of Del. Work, that portion of the report in regard to county books was stricken out.

The report was then adopted.

#### NEBRASKA CASE.

DEL. GERBER: Here is the separate report of the Committee on Ways and Means on the Nebraska situation. It is signed by the full committee:

In regard to the Nebraska controversy that was referred to us, your committee after hearing both sides to the controversy, as well as the National Secretary, after going through the mass of documents, have the following recommenda-

tion to make: That all locals and members at large of the state of Nebraska continue the affiliating with the party and pay the dues direct to the national office, and that all other Socialists in the state of Nebraska are requested to do likewise, and that a national organizer be sent to that state to reorganize it as soon as practicable.

On motion of Del. Berlyn the report was adopted.

#### PAMPHLET ON UNEMPLOYED PROBLEM.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I want to move this resolution: "Resolved, That the National Executive Committee prepare for propaganda a pamphlet fully discussing the cause and remedy for the unemployed problem." (Seconded.)

In this campaign in which we are beginning, there is to my mind one central place where we must fight, and the democratic and republican parties are going to try to escape the issues. They are going to belittle and begot and cloud the issue to keep out of the minds of the people the real issue. The real issue now is, "What is the cause of this unemployed problem, and what is the remedy?" And I want issued from the National Socialist party of the United States a document so that I can give that to my democratic and republican friends, so that the Socialists of the United States can go to the meetings of the democratic and republican parties and there be ready to distribute this pamphlet and ask this question of the democrats and republicans: "What is the cause of the unemployed problem, and what is the remedy?" And if they fail to comply with your request, then you can have this document and give it to them and say, "This is the position of the Socialist party." I hope this resolution will be unanimously adopted.

The resolution was then adopted.

#### PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS.

DEL. YOUNG (Pa.): I move that the National Executive Committee be empowered to publish the proceedings of this convention.

The motion was seconded and carried.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT BY COMMISSION.

Del. Hills of Iowa presented the fol-

lowing report of the committee on government by commission:

DEL. HILLS: Government by commission is a new form of municipal government and has had various methods of operation in the cities in which it has been introduced. In the main, its general principle contemplates superseding the elective principle by the appointive, and when the elective principle is retained, it plans to displace the party method of election by a so-called non-partisan method. Where the system is in actual operation, it has resulted in eliminating all third party tickets from the field in the final elections. It is evident that its only intent is to deprive the working class from any further participation in an already very limited participation in the affairs of government. This so-called non-partisan movement is one of the many schemes of the capitalist class to confuse the workers and obscure the class struggle and give the capitalist class a stronger hold upon the law-making power.

The Socialist party recognizes that the class struggle exists within the capitalist system of production; that the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interest of the capitalist class, and that all activity is and must of necessity be an expression of the interests of these classes that are involved in the struggle, and for this purpose political parties are organized and constituted.

The Socialist party stands opposed to any system of election of officers in city, state or nation, that will displace a party system of election or any system that proposes appointment to office instead of election. The system contains other features that in the short time at the disposal of your committee we have been unable to fully analyze for want of sufficient data. We find that the form of it is intricate and technical, and that a careful study should be given it.

DEL. HILLS: (pausing in report): I will say right here that it appears our committee this afternoon decided to make a little change—that is, a majority of the committee.

(Report resumed.)

We therefore recommend that a committee of five be elected by this convention to investigate this question and report their findings to the National Executive Committee within six months,

and that said report shall become a basis for further action by the party.

DEL. HILLS: Now, the change is this: a majority of the committee consulted and had agreed, for the sake of expediting the work of this convention, that instead of taking a long time to elect this committee, we would submit the proposition of having the National Executive Committee elect this committee. I say a majority of the committee is committed to that proposition. Now, before we take up the matter I might state that at least a few of the delegates here who do not understand altogether what government by commission is. Some have suggested that we ought not to bring in a report against it. Some comrades, I believe, who have heard speakers speaking in Kansas City, report that they were very much pleased with this new system of government. Now, in regard to that, I want to say to the comrades here that President Eliot of Harvard University is very much pleased with this system of government, and he comes out and speaks upon the subject in that way. In this respect, understand, the committee does not take any decided position on all points relative to this matter, but we do take a decided position against the so-called non-partisan feature of the election of officers in city, state or nation. And so it is for this purpose principally that we bring in our report, to show you the undemocratic features of this system, to show you how it disfranchises the working class, how it is contrary to the interests of the working class; and inasmuch, comrades, as this system is rapidly spreading all over the country—and I might say as a resident of the City of Des Moines which I might say is now the fountain head of the commission form of government, admitting to the Texas comrades that the City of Galveston was the first place where it was tried—but since the City of Des Moines has established it I will say that the newspapers report that they are writing from all over this nation, writing to the City of Des Moines to get ideas on this plan of government by commission. I will say this to the comrades, that if the movement spreads out, if it begins to take all our large cities, cities of 25,000 or over, and if it keeps on as it is, it will only be a question of a short time until the Socialist party will be eliminated from partisan

politics in city affairs. Now, the question is for us to consider, can we as a party afford to be eliminated in that way, or do we want to go on the ticket as Socialists and not as non-partisan candidates? That is a question that is largely involved in this plan.

There are some features about this system that might be meritorious, but we do not know. I believe Comrade Work might agree that there are some features about the commission form of government that are meritorious, but as I say, we do not know. I would call your attention to this one thing; that whenever the capitalists go into the legislature to secure any new form of government, any new scheme which especially eliminates the Socialist party and disfranchises the working class, I want you to beware of what they are doing. I do not propose to take any more of your time, but I want you to consider this on its merits, and if you please, have this committee elected to further investigate the question and report to the National Executive Committee for further action.

The motion was seconded.

DEL. HOLMAN (of Galveston): I live in one of those towns—

T. E. CHAIRMAN: Do you make a motion?

DEL. HOLMAN: I say I live in one of those towns, and I would like to correct a statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded to adopt the report of the committee.

DEL. SPARGO: I desire to move an amendment: that the convention concur in the first part of the report which pledges the party that it is against the principle involved in government by commission, the principle of disfranchising the working class. In place of the reference to the National Executive Committee, I desire that we content ourselves with a recommendation to the editors of our party press that they give the matter due consideration. I do not believe this is a matter which in these coming months ought to take up the time of our National Executive Committee, so the motion is that we concur in the first part of the report, and that the editors of our party press be asked to give the matter due attention in their columns.

The amendment was seconded.

The previous question was moved.

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): Comrade Spargo does not distinctly state what words of this report we must adopt and what words we shall reject, and therefore I wish to oppose his amendment. One point was to adopt the entire report which states distinctly that we are against anything which tends to do away with partisanship. We are—by that means placing ourselves, comrades, on an inconsistent platform, for in our platform we stand for direct legislation, and direct legislation is decidedly contrary to partisanship and intends to destroy it, and I for one would be very glad to destroy partisanship. It is not the Socialist party that is going to help us. The people who understand Socialist principles are voting for Socialist measures. Every movement we can make in the direction of an intelligent voting population is a step in advance. I tried to make this point clearly when you were adopting your immediate demands. The principal thing we should work for now is an opportunity to be able to fight for what the party advocates. Now, as for government by commission, we all admit that we know nothing about it. We cannot advocate it and cannot refute it. But when we state that we are against anything that tends to destroy partisanship, we are making fools of ourselves, for we have distinctly stated that we stand for direct legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the previous question be now put. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. Carried. Comrade Hills has five minutes to close. DEL. HILLS: I do not wish to take your time.

The amendment of Del. Spargo was then adopted, whereupon the report as amended was adopted.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEES ELECTED.

Asst. Sec. Reilly then announced that the following comrades had been elected as the Permanent Committee on Farmers' Program: A. M. Simons, Algernon Lee, Emil Herman, Laura B. Payne, Carl D. Thompson, Frank I. Wheat and C. W. Barzee.

He also announced that the following comrades had been elected as the Permanent Committee on Immigration Question: Ernest Untermann, Victor

L. Berger, Joseph Wanhope, John Spargo and Guy E. Miller:

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

Del. Knopfnagel, secretary of the Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations, presented the following report: To the Delegates of the Convention:

Comrades, we are not going to burden you with all the material which came before us for consideration. You have had enough of it these few days. We wish to state, however, that your Committee on the Relationship of Foreign Speaking Organizations to our party consider them worthy of our time and labors. We must not forget that they are proletarians, suffering from the rule and oppression of the same master class you and we who are assembled here suffer from. Neither must we forget that they are the victims of the ward heeled and prostitutes who sell themselves to blight the lives of millions of men, women and children by misleading those of the foreigners who have not tasted of the food of the Socialist philosophy.

We have had before us Comrade Franckel, Cook County Secretary; Comrade Max Kaufman, representing the Jewish Agitation Bureau of the Socialist party, Rochester, N. Y.; Comrade Smith, representing the Lettish Local; Comrade Skala, in behalf of the Bohemians.

A thorough investigation into the affairs of the above named organizations resulted in the unanimous conclusion that our party pay more attention to the foreign speaking organizations.

We, therefore, recommended that all foreign organizations be recognized as party organizations, provided—

(1) They are composed of Socialist party members only.

(2) Any foreign speaking organization having a national form of organization of its own be recognized only if all the branches composing this organization have been chartered by the national, state or local Socialist party organizations, and pay their dues to the respective Socialist party organizations.

(3) No foreign speaking organization asking the S. P. for recognition shall issue their own particular national, state or local charters. Same to be issued only by the respective organizations of the

Socialist party, as the case may require.

(4) All foreign speaking organizations affiliated with the S. P. must and shall conform in every respect with the S. P. national, state and local constitutions, platforms and resolutions.

(5) They should function only as agitation, education and organization bureaux of the S. P.

U. SOLOMON, Chairman,  
LOUIS GOAZIOU,  
ESTHER NIEMINEN,  
T. HITTUNEN,  
S. A. KNOPFNAGEL,  
Sec. of Com.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend by providing that when application for membership is made by any persons willing to sign the party pledge, pay the dues and comply with the conditions of membership, no discrimination shall be made against them on account of their race. (Seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON: Isn't that now in the constitution of the party? Is it necessary to adopt a special resolution?

DEL. GAYLORD: There is a good reason, and it is this: You cannot in the constitution tell a state organization just what they must do. The general conditions are prescribed in the constitution. This is a resolution, and therefore is not mandatory in the form of the constitution.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I did not understand the remark of the chairman of the committee when he referred to a preamble. He did not read it. If there is a preamble to that report it would be carried with the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. NAV. SEC. BARNES: Comrade Gaylord is trying to cover a situation which is about as follows, as I am informed. Local San Francisco decided to reorganize on the ward organization plan, and it has eliminated a strong Finnish organization which was heretofore conducted on a nationality basis. He is now trying to see how his proposition will cure the matter, and I think we ought to have some further explanation from some comrade from San Francisco.

DEL. TUCK (Cal.): As state secretary of California I will state that the state constitution of California does not make any specific provision for the organization of foreign branches, that is, any specific provision that protects them in any particular right. That is

reserved to the local, and that has happened in San Francisco, and that local has seen fit to adopt a constitution which eliminates all foreign language branches or organizations from the party. The foreign speaking comrades are compelled to join the Syndicalist branches of the party as individuals and take part in party business in the English speaking branches. That has been a great hardship on the Finnish comrades, and the Jewish comrades I believe are also affected in the same way and they have the same ground of complaint. The Finnish comrades protested against being deprived of the right of language organization, but I felt that I could do nothing in the matter as state secretary, as the local had the power in its hands. The Finnish comrades there still maintain a strong Finnish organization, pay dues themselves or through the organization, but do not have the party stamp and have no part in party organization affairs. It is a hardship, and if this convention would do anything to help the matter it would be well for it to do it. But I fail to see how under state autonomy it can do it except by putting it in the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is the adoption of the resolution offered by the comrade.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): A question of privilege. I am local organizer in my state.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that the convention wants to hear a personal statement from an organizer. Does the convention want to hear it?

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. McDEVITT: The question of San Francisco is brought up, and the chair has heard from San Francisco, and I would like to answer if the chair will permit.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

DEL. McDEVITT: We have a large organization of the Finnish comrades in San Francisco. The headquarters of the local are in a hall owned by the members of the local in San Francisco. The Finnish comrades at present, so far as I know, are in entire harmony with the organization. A number of them are members. We get along there nicely together. We have just co-operated in a May day Call in which we had a number, comparatively speaking, of nationalities co-operated, and it was an immense suc-

cess. I have not heard as local organizer of any request on their part for a change in our constitution at present. I believe, however, that if the convention thinks that some special provision should be made so that the nationalities can have a right to organize all over the city independently and not be forced in any way to ally themselves to the political subdivisions and towns, there would be no objection to that as far as I am concerned. I simply want to make this statement so as to show that at present there does not seem to be any misunderstanding between the Finnish comrades in San Francisco and the local. They are working in that territory and they are not being interfered with in any way; they have their own local and so on. Some of them are joining privately. The whole organization as such does not seem to evince any particular desire to be a member officially of the party there, and when they do not believe there will be any trouble whatsoever in having an arrangement with them. Certainly I should favor giving them all opportunity possible there and elsewhere.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the resolution offered by Del. Gaylord, providing—let the secretary read it.

Asst. Sec. Reilly read as follows: "That no state or local organization shall refuse admission on account of race or language to any Socialist comrades willing to comply with the constitutional conditions for membership." The motion on the amendment was carried, and the report as amended was then adopted.

#### REPORT OF FINNISH TRANSLATOR.

The following report of the Finnish translator was presented without being read, and on motion adopted.

Today the movement among the Finnish population in this country is not the same trembling, weak organization that it was a short time ago. Prior to the year 1904, there were two different leagues of Finnish workmen, each supported by several branches in different localities and states.

The two organizations, however, did not satisfy even their own members, who found that they were not on the

right track, and that the opportunities for the work in hand were thereby limited; at least, with two organizations there was no hope of accomplishing the best results. The sentiment rapidly grew for one organization and direct affiliation with the Socialist Party of America. However, this proposition raised a considerable discussion when it was learned that the Finnish organization as a whole could not join with the party. It was claimed that each Finnish branch or local connected with its respective county or state organization would disperse and abandon the lines of nationality, which some advocated, and it was recognized and acknowledged by both societies that not understanding the language of the country, and inability to express themselves in the tongue, would disfranchise the Finns of their privileges as party members and prevent them from taking a part in the party affairs. But the issue, "Workers of the world unite," became as a principal matter, and with this as a basis all objections were considered and weighed so as to be overcome by some way or other, and in the year 1904, at the first Finnish Socialist convention in Cleveland, Ohio, a resolution was adopted calling for the affiliation of each and every Finnish branch with its respective county and state organization. The activity in the year 1905 showed much progress. New branches were organized and those already in existence filed their applications with their respective party organizations. The success of improving the methods and laying the plans for carrying on the propaganda work was realized by the members, and in spite of the financial difficulties the second convention was called together at Hibbing, Minn., in August, 1906. This convention was well attended and the basis of our present organization was founded on suggestions relating to the ways and means of the organization set forth by that convention.

The activity of the Finnish comrades and the difficulties in the language compelled them to hire some one to do the translating. This was tried in the states of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and on this practical knowledge was brought up the idea of establishing a National Finnish Translator's office for the benefit of every Finnish branch in the country, and locating the same

at the National Headquarters of the Socialist Party. A committee was elected at the convention to make the arrangements with the National Executive Committee and with its permission the National Finnish Translator's office was started at the National Headquarters on the first of January, 1907.

The Finnish organization then contained 53 locals or branches, representing a membership of some over two thousand, and during the year 1907 the number of branches increased nearly 93 per cent, and at the end of the same year showed an increase in the membership of 75 per cent. At present there are 115 locals or branches in the organization, and the active Finnish locals throughout the country number 136. It might say that the exact number of members is not known, for the actual membership should be based upon the purchase of dues stamps, and as there are some states where the branches are compelled to buy their dues stamps direct from their respective county or state organization, therefore the translator's office lacks the real account of the membership of the organization. The closest estimate I could make is about 4,000.

The organization is conducted by an Executive Committee of county members, who are elected yearly by a referendum vote; a general committee, in which each state is represented according to the number of locals and by referendum of the membership. All the propositions regarding the Finnish organizations only are introduced through the translator's office, which also serves the purpose of the central office of the organization, but in compliance with the rules of the Socialist Party all party affairs are conducted systematically by the various county and state offices. By this manner the Finnish party organizations are conducted in accordance to the constitution and the work done separately, each organization working in its proper sphere. For agitation and organization purposes the country has been divided into three organization districts, and a steady organizer is kept in the field in each district. The number of books and leaflets have been distributed through the translator's office, and the party constitution, platforms and all national, state and county matters have been translated from English to Finnish and propositions from the locals for county,

state or national office formed into English.

The office is maintained and all expenses of the organization paid from the general fund, which is gathered from three main resources: First is the 5-cent assessment; special stamps are issued for that purpose and bought monthly by each local; you will therefore discover that the Finnish comrades voluntarily pay 5 cents per month in excess of the regular party dues. Second is the rebate allowed by the following states on dues stamps sold through the translator's office: Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming. The said rebates of the first year amounted to \$558.23, and from January 1 to May 1, \$240.79; total, \$799.02. Third comes the contributions, which have been very liberal.

The total receipts for the year 1907 were as follows:

Balance from 1906.....	\$ 17.01
Dues .....	4,128.36
Finnish dues .....	1,052.10
Literature and supplies.....	922.66
Miscellaneous .....	608.40

Total .....	\$7,329.52
Total expenses for the same period:	
Dues to National Office.....	\$1,686.35
Dues to State Committees.....	1,883.78
Literature and supplies.....	1,199.23
Miscellaneous .....	1,276.09
Balance to hand .....	784.07

Total .....	\$7,329.52
From January 1 to May 1, 1908:	

#### RECEIPTS.

Dues .....	\$1,701.10
Finnish dues .....	817.65
Literature and supplies.....	231.41
Miscellaneous .....	482.90

Total .....	\$3,233.06
-------------	------------

#### EXPENSES.

Dues to National Office.....	\$ 695.40
Dues to State Committees.....	784.91
Literature and supplies.....	318.15
Miscellaneous .....	997.69
Balance to hand .....	456.91

Total .....	\$3,233.06
Balance from January 1 to	
May 1 .....	\$ 456.91
Balance January 1.....	784.07

Cash on hand May 1, 1908, \$1,240.98  
There is no doubt that the recent

progress in the party movement in Finland has largely affected the success of the Finnish organization in the United States. Although the conditions are different here to those in the old country, the comrades whose veins are filled with the same blood can not be quiet and listen while the others are doing something. While the Finnish comrades have maintained their own organization, supported the National party and responded to many calls for funds to aid the unions during the strikes, and for other purposes of general importance for the working class in this country, they have gladly and joyfully helped the movements in Finland and Russia, reaching their hands deeply into their pockets to meet the financial needs of the comrades on the other side of the ocean. The keen fight for this principle waged within the lines of the Finnish population in this country has sharpened the class issue and cleared the road for Socialism, so that it now is easy to reach the unmorged with our propaganda.

Knowing that the Socialist Party of America stands firmly for the complete emancipation of the wage workers and for the greatest benefit to the working class, and realizing the intellectual and personal misery of those members of the working class who are using the intoxicating liquors as a beverage and understanding the policy of old parties in trying to maintain the system of manufacturing and distributing the liquors and using the method as one of the strongest weapons against the awakening of the proletariat, therefore the sympathy among the Finnish comrades generally is favorable to the temperance and prohibition movement, and for this reason the executive board of the Finnish organization by instruction of the general committee, prepared the following suggestion to the National convention, which is herewith submitted for consideration.

"Whereas, it is self-evident to all class conscious members that the using of intoxicating liquors is dangerous to humanity; that it weakens the thinking ability, enfeebles enthusiasm, is a check to activity, and its every influence is debasing rather than ennobling.

"Further, its victims, lacking the power of determination, are an easy prey to politicians pursuing self-interest.

"Whereas, it is a fact that the capitalist parties pick up all possible re-

forms just for the mere purpose of catching votes, and using the reforms for bait; for instance, the Hearst party in New York and Dunne in Chicago, in past municipal elections.

"And, Whereas, it is known that the program of the prohibition party as a whole actually is included in the program of the Socialist party, so it can be assured that the Socialist party, accepting the prohibition law, and inserting the plank in the party program, would cut out every chance for the existence of the prohibition party, in which many otherwise possessing the Socialist principles are now enrolled. The illustration can be taken from the Socialist party of Finland, where this plank has been inserted into the party platform, its adoption has been a great factor in the advance and increase of the party in Finland.

"Immediately after the adoption the public supporting the prohibition law was ready to join with the party and willing to help the Socialists in elections by all their might. The Socialist representatives in the Finnish Parliament must be credited for the bill recently passed, which prohibits manufacturing, selling and importation of all kinds of intoxicating liquors in Finland."

"A majority of the Finnish population of America are energetic in the temperance movement, and so occupied thereby as to exclude them from participation in the class contest. The urgency of the prohibition movement is for the general welfare and uplift of the human race, and in this sense is in accord with the ideals and purposes of the Socialist party."

"We, therefore, recommend that a plank prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors be inserted in the Party Platform."

The necessity of establishing and maintaining a translator's office for every nationality should be apparent to everyone. As far as the Finns are concerned, there is no doubt that both the National and Finnish organizations are greatly benefited by the office, and I think the same result could be reached among other nationalities. My opinion, however, is that the main thing is, first, to get good organizers of different nationalities, the kind who are well acquainted with the tactics of the party, and set them on the field to explain the importance of trying to get posted with

the party affairs and into closer touch with the party organization. I therefore suggest that the National Convention consider that proposition most seriously from the standpoint, not of trying to establish translators' offices and offering to any nationality something which is not wanted or called for, but making all efforts to create the sentiment among the members that everyone ought to take an active part in the movement and the vital importance of securing a general knowledge of the movement of all the Socialist forces. This kind of work will require not agitators, but organizers who themselves are interested in the propaganda of forming one solid, unbreakable organization, and as long as there is a large number of persons in the party membership who are unable to speak and understand the prevailing language it can not be done without establishing and maintaining national translator's offices. These offices should be located at the National Headquarters and maintained under the direction of the National Executive Committee.

Praternally submitted,

VICTOR WATIA,

National Finnish Translator.

May 10, 1908.

#### PRINTING OF PLATFORM AND CONSTITUTION.

DEL ANDERSON (N. D.): Having adopted our platform and constitution, we all want it in a form that is handy to carry in our pockets and durable; and knowing by experience how easily the leaflet form is worn and destroyed, I move that our platform and constitution be printed in pamphlet form under good covers for distribution, and to be sold to the membership at not over ten cents a copy. (Seconded.)

The chairman put the question, but before the announcement of the result was made—

DEL ANDERSON: I am not through.

A motion was made to lay on the table.

DEL SLOBODIN: What do we want to sell the constitution for? I demand that the platform be printed.

DEL ANDERSON: I am not through with that resolution. I want the platform and constitution in leaflet form only, for free distribution, and that they be printed in pamphlet form



so that we can carry it in our pocket and have it handy.

Del. Solomon moved to refer to the National Executive Committee. Motion seconded and carried.

#### REFERENDUM ON CONSTITUTION.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: I would like to ask a question of information, Mr. Chairman, whether the action of this convention will go to a referendum vote of the membership?

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. GOEBEL: Does everything go? To settle the matter, I move you— At this point some confusion occurred, and the chairman recognized National Secretary Barnes.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: So far as I know, it is only provided that all amendments to the constitution shall be submitted to the referendum, and if you desire the platform to be submitted a motion should be made and voted.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: I make a motion that all acts of the convention be submitted to the referendum of the national party membership. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: No, not all. I make a point of order. My point of order is that we appointed committees and so on, and that is the act of the convention, and we cannot submit it to a referendum. It is nonsense. But I move as an amendment that we submit our platform and constitution to a referendum of the party.

The motion on the amendment was seconded and carried.

Delegates Lockwood and Stirtion, of Michigan, explained their votes on this and other questions as follows:

"Understanding that the individual delegates have the privilege of recording with the secretary of this convention their position on actions taken at this convention, we desire to have this statement become a part of the official files.

"The State of Michigan, which we represent, has at two regular state conventions, and ratified by referendum vote, declared for three important propositions. First, a unity of all the forces that make for the Socialist revolution. Second, for the principle of industrial unionism as against the principle of craft unionism. Third, for a party owned press.

"We have consistently stood by every

measure favoring these points on which the state which sent us has clearly expressed itself, and have as consistently fought all motions to the contrary.

"We believe our state, while favorable to municipal and state programs, or so-called immediate demands, is not favorable to such demands in our national platform, but stands for the adoption of a clear cut revolutionary platform, without such demands, which are in their nature compromises with capitalism. We have consistently stood for the revolutionary program against what we consider to be opportunism.

"We have stood against any and all official expressions of the party on the question of religion.

"Furthermore, we have in every instance stood for democracy, and among other things for the referendum of the recently adopted national platform to the rank and file.

"In all the above matters, we have been in the minority, and inasmuch as a roll call has not been taken, we wish to put ourselves on record and that this statement become a part of the files of this convention proceedings.

DEL. SPARGO: Comrade Chairman and comrades, I suppose we will all agree that we want to go home. I suppose that likewise we are all agreed that we do not want this convention to melt away in a rabble. It is well that, having worked hard all week or eight days, we should end our convention in as good spirit as that with which we began our convention, and I am satisfied that when we get back home and have had time to forget our tired natures and had time to think more calmly of our personal differences here, that each of us will look back to this convention as one of the greatest privileges in our lives. (Applause.) I believe sincerely—and I am not now making the conventional statement usual to such occasions—that we shall admit ten years from now that the convention of 1908 practically marked the birth of the Socialist movement as a political party of the working class in this country. (Applause.) I am not going to ask you to listen to any sort of an address now. It is not even a motion, but I do ask you, comrades, let us rise and join in three cheers for the Socialist movement and the Socialist party.

The delegates rose and gave three cheers amid great enthusiasm.

#### PROHIBITION QUESTION.

DEL. BERGER: There is something more. We have adopted a Finnish report containing the following: "We therefore recommend that a plank prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors be inserted in the party platform." I cannot go back to Milwaukee with that.

A delegate moved to reconsider. The motion was seconded.

DEL. FARRELL: It was not adopted; it was only accepted.

DEL. BERGER: I move that this be referred to the National Executive Committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. FARRELL: Oh, no.

DEL. BERGER: Then I move a reconsideration. (Seconded.)

Del. D'Orsay of Massachusetts moved to refer to the National Committee. (Seconded.)

It was moved to lay the motion on the table.

Del. Stedman moved, and it was seconded, to refer to the National Executive Committee.

DEL. CARR: There is no use in getting so excited. Let us not do anything foolish. This report was adopted in a very foolish manner by the convention. Not having read it, I did not know what

was in it, and I did not vote to adopt it.

DEL. BERGER: The motion is to refer to the National Executive Board.

DEL. CARR: I do not suppose there is any prohibitionist in this convention that would insist on a prohibition plank in our platform.

THE CHAIRMAN: Make your motion, Comrade Carr.

DEL. CARR: I am not responsible for getting into this mess, but as I have got the floor—

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.): A point of order.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: A point of order. There is nothing before the house, and he has no right to talk.

DEL. CARR: The disposition of this matter is before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. BERGER: There is a motion to lay it upon the table.

DEL. CARR: I am going to make a motion—

DEL. SLOBODIN: I move that the report be received and referred to the National Executive Committee.

Motion seconded and carried.

It was then moved to adjourn sine die, and the convention then, at six o'clock, with the singing of the "Marseillaise," adjourned sine die.

## SOCIALIST PARTY PLATFORM.

### PRINCIPLES.

Human life depends upon food, clothing and shelter. Only with these assured are freedom, culture and higher human development possible. To produce food, clothing or shelter, land and machinery are needed. Land alone does not satisfy human needs. Human labor creates machinery and applies it to the land for the production of raw materials and food. Whoever has control of land and machinery controls human labor, and with it human life and liberty.

Today the machinery and the land used for industrial purposes are owned by a rapidly decreasing minority. So long as machinery is simple and easily handled by one man, its owner cannot dominate the sources of life of others. But when machinery becomes more complex and expensive, and requires for its effective operation the organized effort of many workers, its influence reaches over wide circles of life. The owners of such machinery become the dominant class.

In proportion as the number of such machine owners compared to all other classes decreases, their power in the nation and in the world increases. They bring ever larger masses of working people under their control, reducing them to the point where muscle and brain are their only productive property. Millions of formerly self-employed workers thus become the helpless wage slaves of the industrial masters.

As the economic power of the ruling class grows it becomes less useful in the life of the nation. All the useful work of the nation falls upon the shoulders of the class whose only property is its manual and mental labor power — the wage worker — or of the class who have but little land and little effective machinery outside of their labor power — the small traders and

small farmers. The ruling minority is steadily becoming useless and parasitic. A bitter struggle over the division of the products of labor is waged between the exploiting propertied classes on the one hand and the exploited, propertyless class on the other. In this struggle the wage working class cannot expect adequate relief from any reforms of the present order at the hands of the dominant class.

The wage workers are therefore the most determined and irreconcilable antagonists of the ruling class. They suffer most from the curse of class rule. The fact that a few capitalists are permitted to control all the country's industrial resources and social tools for their individual profit, and to make the production of the necessities of life the object of competitive private enterprise and speculation is at the bottom of all the social evils of our time.

In spite of the organization of trusts, pools and combinations, the capitalists are powerless to regulate production for social ends. Industries are largely conducted in a planless manner. Through periods of feverish activity the strength and health of the workers are mercilessly used up, and during periods of enforced idleness the workers are frequently reduced to starvation.

The climaxes of this system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years.

The capitalist class, in its mad race for profits, is bound to exploit the workers to the very limit of their endurance and to sacrifice their physical, moral and mental welfare to its own insatiable greed. Capitalism keeps the masses of the workingmen in poverty, destitution, physical exhaustion and ignorance. It drags their wives from their

homes to the mill and factory. It snatches their children from the playgrounds and schools and grinds their slender bodies and unformed minds into cold dollars. It disfigures, maims and kills hundreds of thousands of workingmen annually in mines, on railroads and in factories. It drives millions of workers into the ranks of the unemployed and forces large numbers of them into beggary, vagrancy and all forms of crime and vice.

To maintain their rule over their fellow men the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public conscience. They control the dominant parties and, through them, the elected public officials. They select the executives, bribe the legislatures and corrupt the courts of justice. They own and censor the press. They dominate the educational institutions. They own the nation politically and interfere actually just as they own it industrially.

The struggle between wage workers and capitalists grows ever fiercer, and has now become the only vital issue before the American people. The wage-working class, therefore, has the most direct interest in abolishing the capitalist system. But in abolishing the present system, the workmen will free not only their own class, but also all other classes of modern society. The small farmer, who is today exploited by large capital more indirectly but not less effectively than is the wage laborer; the small manufacturer and trader, who is engaged in a desperate and losing struggle for economic independence in the face of the all-conquering power of concentrated capital; and even the capitalist himself, who is the slave of his wealth rather than its master.

The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class, while it is a class struggle, is thus at the same time a struggle for the abolition of all classes and class privileges.

The private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation is the rock upon which class rule is built; political government is its indispensable instrument. The wage-workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation.

The basis for such transformation is rapidly developing within present capitalist society. The factory system, with its complex machinery and minute division of labor, is rapidly destroying all vestiges of individual production in manufacture. Modern production is already very largely a collective and social process. The great trusts and monopolies which have sprung up in recent years have organized the work and management of the principal industries on a national scale, and have fitted them for collective use and operation.

The Socialist Party is primarily an economic and political movement. It is not concerned with matters of religious belief.

In the struggle for freedom the interests of all modern workers are identical. The struggle is not only national, but international. It embraces the world and will be carried to ultimate victory by the united workers of the world.

To unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers of all other classes to this end, is the mission of the Socialist party. In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but by working class victory, to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man.

### PLATFORM FOR 1908.

The Socialist party, in national convention assembled, again declares itself as the party of the working class, and appeals for the support of all workers of the United States and of all citizens who sympathize with the great and just cause of labor.

We are at this moment in the midst of one of those industrial breakdowns that periodically paralyze the life of the nation. The much-boasted era of our national prosperity has been followed by one of general misery. Factories, mills and mines are closed. Millions of men, ready, willing and able to provide the nation with all the necessities and comforts of life are forced into idleness and starvation.

Within recent years the trust and monopolies have attained an enormous and menacing development. They have acquired the power to dictate the terms

upon which we shall be allowed to live. The trusts fix the prices of our bread, meat and sugar, of our coal, oil and clothing, of our raw material and machinery, of all the necessities of life.

The present desperate condition of the workers has been made the opportunity for a renewed onslaught on organized labor. The highest courts of the country have within the last year rendered decision after decision depriving the workers of rights which they had won by generations of struggle.

The attempt to destroy the International Federation of Miners, although defeated by the solidarity of organized labor and the Socialist movement, revealed the existence of a far-reaching and unscrupulous conspiracy by the ruling class against the organization of labor.

In their efforts to take the lives of the leaders of the miners the conspirators violated state laws and the federal constitution in a manner seldom equaled even in a country so completely dominated by the profit-seeking class as is the United States.

The congress of the United States has shown its contempt for the interests of labor as plainly and unmistakably as have the other branches of government. The laws for which the labor organizations have continually petitioned have failed to pass. Laws ostensibly enacted for the protection of labor have been distorted against labor.

The working class of the United States cannot expect any remedy for its wrongs from the present ruling class or from the dominant parties. So long as a small number of individuals are permitted to control the sources of the nation's wealth for their private profit in competition with each other and for the exploitation of their fellowmen, industrial depressions are bound to occur at certain intervals. No currency reforms or other legislative measures proposed by capitalist reformers can avail against these fatal results of utter anarchy in production.

Individually competition leads inevitably to combinations and trusts. No amount of government regulation, or of publicity, or of restrictive legislation will arrest the natural course of modern industrial development.

While our courts, legislatures and executive offices remain in the hands of the ruling classes and their agents, the government will be used in the inter-

ests of these classes as against the toilers.

Political parties are but the expression of economic class interests. The Republican, the Democratic, and the so-called "independence" parties and all parties other than the Socialist party, are financed, directed and controlled by the representatives of different groups of the ruling class.

In the maintenance of class government both the Democratic and Republican parties have been equally guilty. The Republican party is the Socialist party of the national government and has been directly and actively responsible for these wrongs. The Democratic party, while saved from direct responsibility by its political impotence, has shown itself equally subservient to the aims of the capitalist class whenever and wherever it has been in power. The old chattel slave owning aristocracy of the south, which was the backbone of the Democratic party has been supplanted by a child slave plutocracy. In the great cities of our country the Democratic party is allied with the criminal element of the slums as the Republican party is allied with the predatory criminals of the palace in maintaining the interests of the possessing class.

The various "reform" movements and parties which have sprung up within recent years are but the clumsy expression of widespread popular discontent. They are not based on an intelligent understanding of the historical development of civilization and of the economic and political needs of our time. They are bound to perish as the numerous providable class reform movements of the past have perished.

#### PROGRAM.

As measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of this ultimate aim, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following program:

##### General Demands.

1—The immediate government relief for the unemployed workers by building schools, by reforesting of cut-over and waste lands, by reclamation

of arid tracts, and the building of canals, and by extending all other useful public works. All persons employed on such works shall be employed directly by the government under an eight-hour work-day and at the prevailing union wages. The government shall also loan money to states and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works. It shall contribute to the funds of labor organizations for the purpose of assisting their unemployed members, and shall take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

2—The collective ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamship lines and all other means of social transportation and communication, and all land.

3—The collective ownership of all industries which are organized on a national scale and in which competition has virtually ceased to exist.

4—The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water power.

5—The scientific reforestation of timber lands, and the reclamation of swamp lands. The land so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain.

6—The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage.

##### Industrial Demands.

7—The improvement of the industrial condition of the workers.

(a) By shortening the workday in keeping with the increased productivity of machinery.

(b) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

(c) By securing a more effective inspection of workshops and factories.

(d) By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age.

(e) By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of

child labor, of convict labor and of all unsanitary factories.

(f) By abolishing official charity and substituting in its place compulsory insurance against unemployment, illness, accident, invalidism, old age and death.

##### Political Demands.

8—The extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the amount of the bequests and to the nearness of kin.

9—A graduated income tax.

10—Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction.

11—The initiative and referendum, proportional representation and the right of recall.

12—The abolition of the senate.

13—The abolition of the power usurped by the supreme court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed or abrogated only by act of Congress or by a referendum of the whole people.

14—That the constitution be made amendable by majority vote.

15—The enactment of further measures for general education and for the conservation of health. The bureau of education to be made a department. The creation of a department of public health.

16—The separation of the present bureau of labor from the department of commerce and labor, and the establishment of a department of labor.

17—That all judges be elected by the people for short terms, and that the power to issue injunctions shall be curbed by immediate legislation.

18—The free administration of justice.

Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole power of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance.

## CONSTITUTION AS AMENDED.

### ARTICLE I. Name.

Sec. 1. The name of this organization shall be the Socialist Party, except in such states where a different name has or may become a legal requirement.

### ARTICLE II. Membership.

Sec. 1. Every person, resident of the United States of the age of eighteen years and upward, without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist Party, including political action, shall be eligible to membership in the Party.

Sec. 2. Any person occupying a position, honorary or remunerative, by gift of any party other than the Socialist Party (civil service positions excepted), shall not be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party.

Sec. 3. A member who desires to transfer his membership from the party in one state to the party in another state may do so upon the presentation of his card showing him to be in good standing at the time of asking for such transfer.

Sec. 4. No member of the party, in any state or territory, shall under any pretext, interfere with the regular or organized movement in any other state.

Sec. 5. All persons joining the Socialist Party shall sign the following pledge: "I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class and the necessity of the working class constituting themselves into a political party distinct from and opposed to all parties formed by the propertied classes, hereby declare that I have severed my relations with all other parties, that I indorse the platform and constitution of the Socialist Party, including the

principle of political action, and hereby apply for admission to said party."

Sec. 6. Any member of the party who opposes political action as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the party.

### ARTICLE III. Management.

Sec. 1. The affairs of the Socialist Party shall be administered by a National Committee, its officers and executive Committee, the party conventions, and the general vote of the party.

Sec. 2. Three years' consecutive membership in the party shall be necessary to qualify for all national official positions.

### ARTICLE IV. National Committee.

Sec. 1. Each organized state or territory shall be represented on the National Committee by one member and by an additional member for every two thousand members or major fraction thereof in good standing in the party. For the purpose of determining the representation to which each state or territory may be entitled, the National Secretary shall compute at the beginning of each year the average dues-paying membership of such state or territory for the preceding year.

Sec. 2. The members of this committee shall be elected by referendum vote of and from the membership of the states or territories which they respectively represent. Their term of office shall not be more than two years. The members of the National Committee shall be subject to removal by referendum vote of their respective states.

Sec. 3. The National Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the National

Committeemen in attending meetings shall be paid from the National Treasury.

Sec. 5. No motion shall be submitted to a referendum of the National Committee by correspondence unless supported within thirty days by not less than five members of the National Committee from three different states.

Sec. 6. The National Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with the provisions of this constitution.

### ARTICLE V. Duties and Powers of the National Committee.

Sec. 1. The duties of this committee shall be to represent the party in all national and international affairs; to call national nominating conventions and special conventions decided upon by the referendum of the party; to make reports to national conventions, and to receive and pass upon all reports and actions of the Executive Committee.

Sec. 2. The National Committee shall neither publish nor designate any official organ.

### ARTICLE VI. National Executive Committee.

Sec. 1. The National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members, elected by the National Committee from the membership of the party, and they shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and elections shall be issued in the month of November of even numbered years.

Sec. 2. The duties of the National Executive Committee shall be to supervise and direct the work of the National Secretary; to organize unorganized states and territories; to receive and pass upon the reports of the National Secretary, and to transact all current business of the national office, except such as is by this constitution expressly reserved for the National Committee or the general vote of the party. The National Executive Committee shall also formulate the rules and order of business of the national conventions of the party not otherwise provided for by this constitution, subject to adoption or amendment by the conventions.

Sec. 3. The Executive Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with this constitution or with the rules of the National Committee.

Sec. 4. The Executive Committee shall transmit copies of the minutes of its meetings to all members of the National Committee, and all its acts and resolutions shall be subject to the revision of the National Committee.

Sec. 5. The National Executive Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so. Between sessions all its business shall be transacted by correspondence.

### ARTICLE VII. National Secretary.

Sec. 1. The National Secretary shall be elected by the National Committee and shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and election shall be conducted at the same time and the same manner as that of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in a similar manner. The National Secretary shall receive as compensation the sum of Fifteen Hundred Dollars annually and shall give a bond in a sum fixed by National Executive Committee.

Sec. 2. The National Secretary shall have charge of all affairs of the National office subject to the directions of the Executive Committee, and the National Committee. He shall receive the reports of the state organizations and of the local organizations in unorganized states and territories. He shall supervise the accounts of the national office, and the work of the lecture bureau, the literature bureau and such other departments as may hereafter be established in connection with the national office.

Sec. 3. The National Secretary shall issue to all party organizations in such way as the Executive Committee may direct, monthly bulletins containing a report of the financial affairs of the party, a summary of the conditions and the membership of the several state and territorial organizations, the principal business transacted by his office, and such other matters pertaining to the organization and activity of the party, as may be of general interest to the membership. Such bulletins shall not contain editorial comment.

Sec. 4. The National Secretary shall be empowered to secure such help as may be necessary for the proper transaction of the business of his office.

Sec. 5. The National Secretary may be recalled at any time by the National Committee or membership.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## The Lecture Bureau.

Sec. 1. There shall be maintained in connection with the national office a Lecture Bureau for the purpose of arranging tours for lecturers for the propaganda of Socialism.

Sec. 2. The Lecture Bureau shall have the right to make arrangements for the lecturers under its auspices with all state organizations of the party.

Sec. 3. The National Committee shall establish a uniform rate of compensation for all lecturers and organizers working under its auspices.

## ARTICLE IX.

## The Literature Bureau.

Sec. 2. The National Committee shall also maintain in the headquarters of the party a department for the dissemination of Socialist literature.

Sec. 2. The Literature Bureau shall keep for sale to the local organizations of the party and others, a stock of Socialist books, pamphlets and other literature, and shall have the right, with the approval of the committee, to publish works on Socialism for the purpose of Socialist propaganda, but this clause shall not be construed as authorizing the bureau to publish any periodical.

Sec. 3. The profits of the Literature Bureau shall go into the general funds of the party treasury.

## ARTICLE X.

## Conventions.

Sec. 1. The regular national nominating convention of the party shall be held in all years in which elections for President and Vice President of the United States are to be held.

Sec. 2. A congress of the party to consider and report upon the program, agitation and organization of the party shall be held in each even numbered year, when there is no national nominating convention. The order of business of the congress shall be prepared by the National Executive Committee, subject to the approval of the congress. The order of representation shall be one delegate at large and one delegate for every five hundred members. Delegates shall be elected and accredited otherwise as for a nominating convention.

Sec. 3. Special conventions of the party may be held at any time if decid-

ed upon by a general vote of the party membership.

Sec. 4. The dates and places of holding such regular or special conventions shall be fixed by the National Committee.

Sec. 5. The basis of representation in any national nominating convention shall be by states, each state and territory being entitled to one delegate at large, and one additional delegate for every four hundred members, or majority fraction thereof above the first 400, in good standing; provided, however, that no delegate shall be considered eligible unless he is a resident of the state from which the credential is presented, and shall have been a member of the party for at least two years.

Sec. 6. Railroad fare of the delegates, going to and coming from the convention and the congresses of the party shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by a per capita assessment on the entire membership.

Sec. 7. The election of delegates to the National Conventions shall take place not later than sixty days preceding the National Convention and the respective State Secretaries shall furnish the National Secretary not later than thirty days preceding such convention with a list of the accredited delegates to the convention.

The National Secretary shall prepare a printed roster of the accredited delegates to be sent to each delegate and forwarded to the party press for publication. That such list shall contain the occupation of each delegate and his office or employment in the party. That all official reports required to be presented to the National Convention shall be printed and sent to each delegate elected at least fifteen days before the date of the conventions and furnished to the party press for publication. At the time and place set for the opening of the National Convention the National Secretary shall call the convention to order, and shall call the roll to ascertain the number of uncontest delegates, and they shall permanently organize the convention.

The following order of business shall be observed:

1. Election of Chairman for the day.
2. Election of Secretary, Reading Clerk and Sergeant-at-Arms.

## ARTICLE XII.

## State Organizations.

Sec. 1. The formation of all state or territorial organizations or the reorganization of state or territorial organizations which may have lapsed shall be under the direction of the Executive Committee, and in conformity with the rules of the National Committee.

Sec. 2. No state or territory may be organized unless it has at least ten locals or an aggregate membership of not less than two hundred; but this provision shall not affect the rights of states and territories organized prior to the adoption of this constitution. When the membership of any state averages less than 150 per month for any six consecutive months, the National Committee may revoke the charter of that state.

Sec. 3. The platform of the Socialist Party shall be the supreme declaration of the party, and all state and municipal platforms shall conform thereto; and no state or local organization shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise with any other political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations, in order to favor the candidate of such other organizations, nor shall any candidate of the Socialist Party accept any nomination or endorsement from any other party or political organization.

Sec. 4. In states and territories in which there is one central organization established with the party, the state or territorial organizations shall have the sole jurisdiction of the members residing within their respective territories, and the sole control of all matters pertaining to the propaganda, organization and financial affairs within such state or territory; their activity shall be confined to their respective organizations, and the National Committee and subcommittees or officers thereof shall have no right to interfere in such matters without the consent of the respective state or territorial organizations.

Sec. 5. The State Committees shall make monthly reports to the National Secretary concerning their membership, financial condition and general standing of the party.

Sec. 6. The State Committee shall pay to National Committee every month a sum equal to five cents for every mem-

## 3. Nomination of the following Regional Committees:

Contested Seats—7 members.

Platform—9 members.

Resolution—9 members.

Ways and Means—9 members.

Reports of National Officers—7 members.

International Relations—5 members.

After opportunity for declarations the complete list of nominations above provided for shall be printed at once in ballot form.

4. Report of Committee on Rules, appointed by the National Executive Committee.

## ARTICLE XI.

## Referendum.

Sec. 1. Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership, upon the request of twenty local organizations, in five or more states or territories, or any smaller number of local organizations in three states having two thousand members in the aggregate; provided, however, that the required number of requests for such a referendum shall all have been made within a period of ninety consecutive days.

Sec. 2. Whenever a request for a referendum shall have been made as above provided, the National Secretary shall forthwith cause the same to be published in the party press, and shall allow such question to stand open for thirty days, within which time amendments may be offered thereto in the same manner in which an original request for a referendum is to be made, and at the close of the said period of thirty days the original motion submitted to referendum, together with all and any amendments which may have been offered, shall be submitted to the vote of the party members, and such vote shall close fifty days thereafter.

Sec. 3. All propositions or other matters submitted for the referendum of the party shall be presented without preamble or comment.

ber in good standing within their respective territories.

Sec. 7. All state organizations shall provide in their constitutions for the initiative, referendum and imperative mandate.

Sec. 8. No person shall be nominated or endorsed by any subdivision of the party for candidate unless he is a member of the party, and has been such for at least one year, but this provision shall not apply to organizations which have been in existence for less than one year.

Sec. 9. In case of controversy in any state as to the validity of the title of its officers and the question of recognition by the national organization, a referendum of the membership of said state to determine the question may be taken in the following manner:

A call signed by not less than one-third of the total membership of the state in good standing at the time the controversy arose, asking the National Executive Committee to conduct a referendum of the said state membership for the election of officers for the position in dispute, shall be filed with the National Secretary.

Upon receiving such call the National Executive Committee shall conduct a referendum of the membership of said state for the election of officers for the position in dispute. All locals appearing on the state list at the National headquarters in good standing at the time the controversy arose shall be privileged to make nominations, and all members in good standing at that time shall be entitled to vote.

Sec. 10. The National Executive Committee may appoint secretaries to reside in the unorganized states, who shall be selected as far as possible from the section in which the state is located. A salary not to exceed \$18.00 per week shall be allowed them, and they shall have complete charge of organization in their respective states. They shall hold office subject to the National Executive

Committee, provided that when there are not less than ten (10) locals or two hundred (200) members in good standing in any state, a state organization may be formed, which shall then elect its own officers.

Sec. 11. The National Executive Committee is authorized to give financial assistance from the national organization to any state organization applying for same, and having a membership of less than 1,200, to enable the Secretary of said state to secure a living wage while giving his entire time to the work of organizing the state.

#### ARTICLE XIII. Headquarters.

Sec. 1. The location of the headquarters of the party shall be determined by the National Committee.

#### ARTICLE XIV. International Delegates.

Sec. 1. Delegates to the International Congress shall be elected by referendum in the year when the congress is held; one delegate for every five thousand members, and their expenses shall be paid out of the treasury of the national party.

#### ARTICLE XV. Amendments.

Sec. 1. This constitution may be amended by a national convention or by a referendum of the party in the manner above provided. But all amendments made by a national convention shall be submitted serially to a referendum vote of the party membership.

#### ARTICLE XVI.

##### Time and Method of Taking Effect.

Sec. 1. This constitution shall take effect and be in force on the first day of January after the time of its approval by national referendum of the party membership.

## INDEX.

- A**
- Abolition of Senate—166, 212.  
 Adams, Wm.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Ambrose, Geo. H.—17, 40, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 290.  
 Amendment of U. S. Constitution—166, 212.  
 American Federation of Labor—96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 110, 154.  
 Anderson, A. S.—17, 61, 159, 160, 164, 219, 223, 254, 290, 317.  
 Anderson, Jules J.—17, 61, 144, 160, 164, 223, 232, 233, 243, 254.  
 Arnstein, Louis—8, 17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Assistant Secretaries—9, 10, 40, 221.  
 Atwood, E. Francis—14, 18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Auditing Committee—Provision for—10, 11.  
 Nomination of—41.  
 Election of—62.  
 Report of—308.
- B**
- Bandlow, Robert—17, 61, 62, 160, 161, 164, 165, 201, 223, 254, 302, 303.  
 Bannell, John—17.  
 Barnes, J. Mahlon—7, 18, 23, 35, 36, 37, 38, 42, 58, 71, 72, 92, 158, 199, 200, 258, 261, 269, 276, 283, 284, 296, 298, 313, 318.  
 Barzee, C. W.—16, 18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 179, 183, 223, 241, 244, 254, 312.  
 Bassett, Arthur—17, 34, 254.  
 Bauer, Kasper—16, 22, 61, 62, 127, 160, 164, 188, 219, 223, 242, 243, 254.  
 Behrens, E. T.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 244.  
 Bell, W. J.—18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254, 255, 256.  
 Bentall, J. O.—17, 40, 61, 62, 161, 164, 201, 223, 254.  
 Berger, Victor L.—8, 13, 15, 18, 28, 37, 41, 49, 50, 58, 59, 61, 62, 111, 113, 119, 127, 131, 143, 144, 145, 152, 157, 161, 164, 183, 185, 201, 203, 205, 223, 227, 228, 229, 240, 241, 242, 254, 264, 265, 269, 270, 274, 278, 281, 292, 294, 297, 298, 299, 300, 313, 318, 319.  
 Berlyn, Barney—11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 29, 45, 61, 62, 113, 115, 161, 164, 223, 237, 251, 254, 260, 261, 283, 284, 289, 310.  
 Bigelow, George E.—62, 91.  
 Bigelow, Mrs. George E.—62.  
 Bigelow, Sarah A.—62, 91.  
 Bills and Ordinances—73.  
 Block, Carrie C.—16, 18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Boomer, George E.—8, 16, 18, 34, 35, 47, 49, 56, 62, 139, 140, 161, 164, 186, 223, 235, 254, 308.  
 Boylan, C. B.—8, 18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Bradford, W. S.—16, 61, 139, 160, 164, 223, 235, 240, 243, 254, 307, 308.  
 Brandt, Wm. M.—17, 24, 61, 62, 74, 81, 161, 164, 223, 254, 310.  
 Branstetter, O. F.—11, 18, 41, 61, 143, 145, 158, 160, 164, 223, 230, 231, 232, 254, 276, 277.  
 Branstetter, Winnie E.—18, 61, 62, 78, 164, 211, 223, 254, 301, 306.  
 Brewer, Grace D.—17, 61, 62, 162, 164, 223, 254, 301.  
 Brower, James H.—14, 17, 61, 71, 74, 78, 139, 146, 151, 152, 161, 164, 206, 221, 223, 254.  
 Brown, E. J.—18, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 60, 71, 161, 164, 196, 223, 225, 226, 254.  
 Brown, Margaret M.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Buchanan, W. W.—18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254, 308.  
 Buie, T. L.—16, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254, 310.
- C**
- Callery, P. H.—17, 61, 146, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Campaign Fund—309.  
 Candidates, State and Local—73.



Hoehn, G. A.—9, 13, 17, 24, 48, 49, 61, 62, 73, 74, 77, 86, 87, 89, 90, 104, 105, 107, 111, 159, 161, 164, 170, 191, 223, 254.  
 Hogan, Dan—16, 61, 99, 137, 141, 160, 164, 223, 231, 234, 236, 254.  
 Holman, H. L. A.—18, 61, 74, 121, 122, 135, 137, 160, 163, 164, 207, 223, 254, 312.  
 Houston, H. W.—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Hunt, Gertrude Breslau—17, 61, 62, 161, 223, 254, 270, 301.  
 Hunter, Robert—17, 61, 99, 100, 140, 141, 161, 164, 198, 199, 223, 254.  
 Hurst, Fred—18, 61, 164, 166, 216, 217, 218, 223, 254, 276, 277.  
 Hutcherson, A.—39, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59.  
 Hymes, Alexander—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.

## I

Immigration Committee, Permanent—  
 Provision for—105.  
 Nomination of—122.  
 Election of—246, 312.  
 Income Tax—165, 211.  
 Ingalls, James S.—17, 19, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254, 280, 282, 298, 299.  
 Inheritance Tax—165, 211.  
 Initiative and Referendum—165, 212, 289.  
 Injunctions—166, 213.  
 Insurance against Accidents, etc.—165, 211.  
 International Congress, Delegates to—249, 296.  
 International Secretary—  
 Report of—64-66.  
 Election of—10, 25, 229.  
 Interstate Transportation—165, 211.

## J

Jacobs, W. A.—18, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 284, 285, 307.  
 Johns, Cloudsley—16, 61, 82, 104, 160, 164, 167, 206, 223, 226, 254, 268, 269.  
 Jones, Ellis O.—17, 61, 62, 160, 163, 164, 223, 254.  
 Jones, J. Sam.—16, 61, 84, 161, 223, 254.  
 Judges for Conviction—9, 40.  
 Judges of Courts—160, 213.  
 Justice, Free Administration of—166, 213.

## K

Kaplan, M.—17, 61, 62, 86, 88, 95, 123, 124, 130, 134, 135, 158, 159, 160, 164, 185, 223, 254, 277.

Katterfeld, Ludwig E.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Kearns, H. R.—17, 61, 66, 77, 90, 92, 96, 98, 123, 160, 164, 223, 254, 256, 285, 286.  
 Kerr, Charles H.—17, 61, 62, 124, 160, 164, 223, 236, 254, 271, 295.  
 Killingbeck, W. B.—10, 17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254, 278.  
 Klenke, August—17, 61, 71, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Knopfnagel, S. A.—17, 62, 115, 160, 164, 183, 202, 223, 225, 254, 313.  
 Knowles, Freeman—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Konikow, Antoinette—17, 61, 62, 79, 164, 208, 223, 254, 263, 274, 301, 302, 303, 304, 306.  
 Korngold, Ralph—98, 160, 163, 164, 171, 207, 208, 223, 225, 254, 278, 298, 307.  
 Kraft, Fred—17, 19, 49, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 283.  
 Krueger, Richard—18, 50, 51, 138, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Kunath, Otto—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 236, 254, 291.

## L

Labor Organizations Committee—  
 Provision for—25-33.  
 Nomination of—41, 43.  
 Election of—62.  
 Report of—93-95.  
 Debate on Report of—95-102.  
 Lammman, J. S.—34, 61, 160, 164, 223.  
 Lee, Algernon—12, 17, 27, 30, 32, 61, 62, 93, 95, 102, 160, 164, 184, 223, 229, 254, 264, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 279, 312.  
 Le Feve, Wells—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Leggett, Robert—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Length of Speeches—8, 10, 22, 92.  
 Letter to President of U. S.—9, 73-90.  
 Lewis, Arthur Morrow—17, 44, 46, 47, 76, 77, 87, 88, 90, 107, 109, 110, 112, 113, 117, 140, 146, 161, 162, 164, 191, 193, 194, 195, 198, 201, 202, 205, 206, 223.  
 Lewis, H. Claude—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Lewis, Thomas J.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Lipscomb, Caleb—17, 61, 62, 161, 162, 164, 223, 254, 256.  
 Liquor Question—90, 317, 319.  
 Lockwood, Guy H.—17, 61, 128, 129, 161, 164, 223, 254, 318.

## M

Maattala, J. G.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Mack, John—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Mahoney, Patrick—17, 61, 71, 160, 163, 164, 223, 254.  
 Majority Rule—166, 212.  
 Mance, A. W.—21, 258.  
 Martin, E. E.—161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Maurer, James H.—18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Maynard, Mila Tupper—16, 61, 62, 141, 164, 192, 193, 223, 229, 254, 301, 306.  
 McAllister, A. S.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 McDevitt, William—16, 18, 19, 61, 71, 98, 100, 160, 164, 223, 232, 233, 254, 282, 306, 314.  
 McKee, Harry M.—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Melms, F. T.—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Menton, Etta—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Metcalf, W. P.—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Mileage of Delegates—70, 71-73, 92, 283, 300.  
 Miller, A. Grant—18, 26, 46, 47, 48, 49, 55, 61, 62, 113, 115, 160, 164, 223, 237, 245, 254, 295.  
 Minority Reports—  
 On Delegates Mileage—283.  
 On Farmers' Program—179.  
 On Manner of Electing Executive Committee—246, 255.  
 On Manner of Electing National Secretary—256.  
 On National Committee Motions—246.  
 On Nebraska Case—34.  
 On Unity Question—123.  
 On Washington Case—34.  
 On Women's Relationship to the Party—301, 302.  
 McFadin, Alice—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Merrill, Mary F.—16, 61, 98, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Miller, Guy E.—16, 23, 24, 25, 40, 41, 61, 73, 106, 107, 109, 111, 160, 162, 164, 210, 223, 254, 313.  
 Moore, Edward—18, 61, 62, 123, 160, 164, 208, 209, 223, 254.  
 Morgan, Thomas J.—8, 12, 17, 30, 40, 51, 62, 160, 164, 222, 223, 225, 226, 229, 230, 231, 234, 236, 237, 242, 254, 260, 261, 300.  
 Morrison, J. M.—16, 61, 160, 164, 184, 210, 223, 254.

## N

National Congress—262-272, 280, 281, 288.  
 National Committee—7, 8, 11, 262, 263, 265, 266, 267, 276, 281, 289, 291, 296, 297, 299, 301, 303, 305, 306, 309, 319.  
 National Constitution as Adopted—325.  
 National Convention—262-272, 280, 281, 282-288, 296.  
 National Executive Committee—  
 Report on Washington Case—43.  
 How Elected—246-255.  
 Duties of—255.  
 Miscellaneous—34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 67, 68, 73, 103, 123, 124, 178, 260, 261, 276, 285, 286, 288, 291, 292, 295, 296, 298, 299, 300, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 318, 319.  
 National Platform as Adopted—320.  
 National Secretary—  
 Voice but No Vote—10, 25.  
 Report of—67-71.  
 How Elected—256, 260.  
 Duties of—261.  
 Bond of—256, 260, 261, 299, 300.  
 Compensation of—256, 260.  
 May Be Recalled—261.  
 Nebraska Case—  
 Credential Committee's Reports on—18, 34.  
 National Secretary's Report on—68.  
 Ways and Means Committee's Report on—310.  
 Niemen, Ester—17, 61, 62, 114, 161, 164, 223, 254, 313.  
 Nomination of Candidate for President—10, 25, 40, 146-161.  
 Nomination of Candidate for Vice-President—10, 25, 40, 161-164.  
 O.  
 O'Hare, Frank P.—18, 21, 40, 61, 91, 137, 138, 143, 150, 159, 160, 164, 182, 223, 254, 271, 272, 281, 287, 295, 298.  
 O'Neill, W. L.—18, 61, 103, 161, 164, 223, 254, 273.  
 Ordinances and Bills—73.  
 Organization—40.  
 Osborne, J. B.—8, 14, 16, 18, 19, 32, 33, 37, 40, 61, 97, 160, 164, 221, 223, 237, 254, 256, 260, 289, 296.  
 P.  
 Paulitsch, Fred—17, 40, 61, 117, 160, 164, 223, 254, 270, 285, 307.  
 Payne, Laura B.—18, 61, 62, 83, 84, 160, 164, 181, 223, 241, 254, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 312.



Peach, Thomas J.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Peiser, Mark—17, 61, 62, 72, 98, 112, 160, 164, 254, 308.  
 Pelsey, Willis E.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Penrose, William—16, 40, 61, 160, 164, 223.  
 Perrin, E. W.—16, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Pettigrew, A. J.—16, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Peura, John—61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Photograph of Delegates—63.  
 Platform Committee—  
   Provision for—10, 11.  
   Nomination of—40.  
   Election of—40, 41.  
   Report of—135, 141, 165-167, 186.  
   Debates on Report of—137-141, 142-146, 165-176, 186-228.  
 Platform Committee Elected by National Committee—  
   Report of Referred—11.  
 Pope, Leander C.—12, 17, 26, 61, 88, 149, 160, 161, 164, 218, 223, 234, 254, 265, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 278, 286, 289, 308, 310.  
 Porter, G. C.—18, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 61, 161, 164, 223, 224, 254, 290.  
 Powers, John—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Press Committee—  
   Provision for—10, 11.  
   Nomination of—41.  
   Election of—62.  
   Report of—306.  
   Debate on Report of—307, 308.  
 Prevey, Marguerite—17, 61, 62, 97, 140, 160, 164, 206, 207, 223, 239, 247, 254, 301, 306.  
 Proportional Representation—166, 212.  
 Putney Squire E.—17, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254.

## Q

Quantz, J. J.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.

## R

Ramp, B. F.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 224, 225, 254.  
 Recall, The—166, 212.  
 Reilly, James M.—8, 16, 17, 34, 40, 61, 98, 140, 141, 144, 160, 164, 193, 214, 221, 223, 224, 237, 243, 248, 254, 267, 270, 271, 277, 286, 314.  
 Resolutions—

  On Appreciation of Arrangements and Services—178.  
 On Bills and Ordinances—73.

On Deprecation of Violence—103.  
 On Free Speech—122.  
 On Immigration—105.  
 On the Liquor Question—90.  
 On Oppressive Primary Laws—103.  
 On Persecution of Mexican Labor Leaders—103.  
 On Propaganda Among Soldiers and Sailors—178.  
 On State and Local Candidates—73.  
 On the Unity Question—123.  
 Resolutions Committee—  
   Provision for—10, 11.  
   Election of—62.  
   Reports of—73, 75, 90, 103, 104, 105, 122, 123, 178.  
   Minority Report of—123.  
   Debates on Reports of—76-91, 103, 104, 106-122, 124-135.  
 Rest Period—165, 206.  
 Reynolds, S. M.—17, 61, 62, 76, 157, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Reynolds, W. B.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Rhodes, J. C.—14, 18, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 256.  
 Rigg, E. L.—17, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 273.  
 Ringler, Robert B.—18, 41, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Rodgers, F. L.—17, 161, 164.  
 Rohrer, Edward J.—17, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Roll Calls—  
   On Washington Case—60, 61.  
   On Candidates for President—160, 161.  
   On Candidates for Vice-President—164.  
   On Motion to Table Substitute for General Program—223.  
   On Manner of Electing Executive Committee—254.  
 Rose, L. D.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Ross, C. C.—18, 35, 37, 61, 72, 123, 164, 191, 223, 254, 282, 293.  
 Religion—165, 191-206.  
 Ryan, R. H.—18, 61, 72, 160, 162, 164, 215, 223, 254.  
 Ryckman, A. H.—93, 161, 164, 223.  
 Rules Committee Elected by National Committee—  
   Report of—9, 22, 25.  
   Debates on Report of—10-16, 20-22, 25-33.

## S

Sandburg, Charles—18, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 310.

Schildge, William—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 225, 254.  
 Schwartz, Fred L.—8, 36, 61, 62, 72, 129, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Secretaries of Convention—9, 10, 19, 258.  
 Seeds, Frank E.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Seidel, Emil—18, 21.  
 Sergeant-at-Arms—9, 10, 40.  
 Sessions of Convention—  
   First Day:  
     Morning—7-9.  
     Afternoon—9-22.  
   Second Day:  
     Morning—23-33.  
     Afternoon—34-41.  
   Third Day:  
     Morning—42-61.  
     Afternoon—61-63.  
   Fourth Day:  
     Morning—64-79.  
     Afternoon—79-92.  
   Fifth Day:  
     Morning—93-102.  
     Afternoon—103-125.  
     Evening—125-164.  
   Sixth Day:  
     Morning—165-177.  
     Afternoon—177-201.  
     Evening—201-220.  
   Seventh Day:  
     Morning—221-229.  
     Afternoon—230-257.  
   Eighth Day:  
     Morning—258-280.  
     Afternoon—280-319.  
 Shortening Work Day—165, 206.  
 Shank, John E.—17, 61, 77, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Simons, A. M.—11, 13, 17, 41, 44, 48, 49, 58, 59, 61, 130, 132, 135, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 148, 150, 151, 152, 160, 161, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 175, 186, 187, 188, 191, 204, 206, 211, 212, 213, 214, 217, 223, 226, 228, 229, 233, 234, 235, 254, 264, 270, 275, 276, 297, 312, 319.  
 Simons, May Wood—17, 61, 62, 161, 163, 164, 223, 254, 264, 265, 303, 304, 306.  
 Slayton, J. W.—9, 18, 61, 62, 66, 67, 111, 156, 160, 162, 163, 164, 179, 188, 191, 202, 203, 223, 233, 245, 254, 262, 263.  
 Slobodin, Henry L.—17, 21, 48, 61, 62, 67, 103, 140, 160, 164, 168, 182, 223, 224, 232, 234, 236, 237, 240, 245, 249, 254, 261, 265, 271, 272, 274, 281, 283, 285, 288, 292, 295, 298, 306, 317, 319.  
 Smith, Alfred W.—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Smith, M. A.—18, 61, 62, 109, 160, 164, 223, 238, 254, 310.  
 Snow, W. R.—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Snyder, J. E.—17, 61, 62, 127, 160, 164, 187, 223, 231, 250, 253, 254, 256, 269, 285, 295.  
 Soldiers and Sailors, Propaganda Among—178.  
 Solomon, U. S.—16, 17, 21, 34, 35, 61, 62, 92, 160, 164, 204, 223, 238, 254, 267, 273, 277, 281, 282, 284, 286, 287, 290, 291, 292, 295, 313, 318.  
 Spargo, John—9, 17, 22, 25, 48, 61, 62, 66, 67, 73, 74, 75, 80, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 115, 118, 121, 122, 123, 125, 136, 134, 147, 160, 164, 169, 178, 182, 203, 205, 206, 223, 238, 250, 251, 254, 263, 264, 270, 283, 296, 297, 312, 313, 318.  
 Stedman, Seymour—9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 49, 62, 64, 146, 148, 149, 161, 163, 164, 223, 254, 280, 292, 299, 300, 319.  
 Stirtan, A. M.—17, 61, 101, 125, 161, 164, 199, 223, 231, 254, 308, 318.  
 Strebel, Gustave—17, 61, 62, 160, 164, 212, 223, 226, 254.  
 Strickland, F. G.—17, 34, 40, 51, 61, 62, 64, 67, 90, 91, 93, 119, 125, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 139, 141, 146, 156, 160, 164, 165, 167, 179, 196, 221, 223, 231, 254.  
 Strobel, G. H.—17, 61, 138, 145, 159, 161, 164, 223, 254, 274.  
 Starkweather, Bertha Wilkins—16, 61, 143, 160, 164, 223, 230, 254, 256.  
 Suffrage, Equal, for Men and Women—165, 211.  
 Syphers, Grant—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 T  
 Tellers—9, 40.  
 Temporary Organization—7, 8.  
 Thomas, E. H.—18, 61, 62, 123, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Thompson, Carl D.—18, 37, 61, 62, 91, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164, 167, 168, 169, 171, 178, 179, 182, 185, 187, 188, 223, 226, 254, 256, 258, 312.  
 Thompson, J. C.—18, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254.  
 Thorsett, Elias—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Toole, William A.—17, 20, 30, 61, 87, 141, 143, 149, 160, 164, 223, 254.  
 Tuck, H. C.—8, 16, 34, 35, 36, 61, 138, 160, 164, 223, 254, 279, 313.

- Tuttle, Howard—61, 62, 74, 76, 78, 117, 158, 159, 161, 164, 223, 248, 254, 266, 270.
- U
- Unemployed, The—166, 171, 213, 310.
- Unity Question—  
 Majority Report on—123.  
 First Minority Report on—123.  
 Second Minority Report on—123.  
 Debate on—124-135.
- Untermann, Ernest—8, 13, 16, 17, 38, 41, 61, 110, 161, 164, 194, 200, 223, 254, 312.
- V
- Vander Porten, C. H.—17, 57, 59, 61, 160, 164, 172, 204, 205, 206, 213, 223, 254, 256.
- Varner, F. C.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Vautrin, Fred F.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Veto Power—166, 212.
- Voss, Joseph E.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- W
- Wagenknecht, Alfred—18, 52, 53, 54, 55, 62, 72, 108, 109, 110, 123, 124, 125, 126, 129, 130, 160, 161, 164, 181, 211, 223, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 254, 256, 270, 288, 318.
- Waldhorst, F. X.—16, 60, 61, 98, 160, 164, 189, 223, 254, 276, 293, 295, 298, 299.
- Walker, John—17, 161, 254.
- Wanhope, Joseph—17, 61, 66, 67, 160, 164, 172, 223, 254, 313.
- Washington Case—  
 Credential Committee's Reports on—18, 34.  
 National Executive Committee's Report on—43.  
 Debates on—38-40, 44-60.
- Ways and Means Committee:  
 Provision for—10, 11.  
 Nomination of—41.  
 Election of—62.  
 Organization Referred to—40.  
 Report of—308.
- Weber, Frank J.—18, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254.
- Westleder, Florence—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
- Western Federation of Miners—23-25, 31, 73, 78, 100, 102, 119, 142, 185, 239.
- Wheat, Frank L.—16, 61, 92, 98, 143, 144, 160, 164, 221, 223, 230, 254, 312.
- White, Dan A.—17, 61, 158, 160, 164, 216, 223, 254.
- White, Eliot—17, 61, 160, 164, 197, 205, 223, 254.
- Wilke, Max—18, 61, 160, 164, 167, 223, 231, 254, 286.
- Wilkins, William H.—8, 17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Wills, J. G.—18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 230, 254.
- Williams, Guy—17, 35, 61, 131, 142, 144, 145, 158, 161, 162, 164, 171, 223, 228, 234, 235, 254, 275, 294.
- Wilson, Benjamin F.—17, 61, 62, 123, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Wilson, Lawrence Albert—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
- Woodby G. W.—16, 57, 61, 106, 160, 163, 164, 208, 218, 223, 249, 254, 290.
- Women's Committee—  
 Provision for—10, 11.  
 Nomination of—41.  
 Election of—62.  
 Report of—300, 301.  
 Minority Report of—301, 302.  
 Debate on Reports of—302-306.
- Women's Committee, Permanent—  
 Provision for—301.  
 Election of—306.
- Work, John M.—8, 11, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 37, 38, 41, 43, 45, 61, 139, 161, 164, 167, 168, 175, 176, 186, 201, 206, 223, 230, 234, 254, 261, 265, 273, 274, 275, 283, 288, 295, 297, 298, 307, 310, 312.
- Y
- Young, Daniel Kissam—61, 62, 88, 108, 109, 160, 164, 223, 243, 254, 308, 310.
- Z
- Ziegler, E. J.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.